DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 300 733 CG 021 229

AUTHOR Reschly, Daniel J.; And Others
TITLE The 1986 NASP Survey: Comparison of Practitioners, NASP Leadership, and University Faculty on Key Issues.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 101p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Continuing Education; *Credentials; *Demography; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Job Satisfaction; Learning Disabilities; *School Psychologists

ABSTRACT

National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) practitioner members (N=600), all recent members of the NASP leadership (N=139), and college faculty (N=166) responded to surveys on a variety of topics and issues including current demographic information, NASP priorities, credentialing, job satisfaction, issues related to learning disabilities and the mildly handicapped, evaluation of training and continuing education needs, and an assessment procedures survey. Demographic results indicated that practitioner school psychologists were increasingly women, had a median age of 38 years, and had at least the specialist degree or the equivalent. Most are employed by public schools. The NASP leadership sample was more evenly divided between men and women, was slightly older than the practitioners, had more years of experience, and was more likely to hold a doctoral degree. The college faculty sample was older, about 75% male, and had a higher salary often supplemented with private practice or consulting income. Both the practitioner and the leadership samples strongly supported the current NASP position concerning nondoctoral credentialing. Concerning items pertaining to issues in learning disabilities and appropriate programs for low achieving and mildly handicapped individuals, the leadership sample was slightly more critical of current practices than were other samples, and more committed to development of alternative delivery systems. Responses from practitioners and faculty on training and continuing education needs revealed needs to improve in the areas of neuropsychology, interventions in regular education for students with behavioral or emotional problems, and regular education interventions for students with learning problems. (Author/NB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CG

ED300733

CG 021229

The 1986 NASP Survey: Comparison of Practitioners, NASP Leadership, and University Faculty on Key Issues

Daniel J. Reschly
Iowa State University

Judy Genshaft
Ohio State University

Marilyn S. Binder
Iowa State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Daniel J. Reschly

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

---

[1] The content of this document reflects the ideas of the authors. The responsibility lies solely with the authors and does not necessarily reflect the position or ideas of the National Association of School Psychologists.

Table of Contents

Abstract 3

Overview 4

Results 6

Sample Size/Return Rate 6

Age and Sex 7

Experience and Teaching Background 8

Degree, Employment, and Income 11

NASP Priorities 19

Reimbursement for Convention Delegate Assembly/Executive Board 22

NASP Executive/Office Structure 22

Public Relations and Policy Advocacy 23

Computer Access and Use 24

School Psychology Credentialing (Licensure) 24

Job Satisfaction/Time in Special Education 30

Issues Related to the Mildly Handicapped 34

Quality of Training, Continuing Education Needs, and Program Improvement 40

Assessment Procedures Survey 47

References 58

Appendix A - Practitioner Sample - Green Form 59

Appendix B - Practitioner Sample - Blue Form 68

Appendix C - NASP Leadership Sample - Yellow Form 77

Appendix D - Faculty Sample - Salmon Form 89

ABSTRACT

Two randomly selected samples of NASP practitioner members (N = 600), all recent members of the NASP leadership (N = 139), and a randomly selected sample of faculty (N = 166) responded to surveys designed to provide information on a variety of topics and issues including, current demographic information, NASP priorities, credentialing, job satisfaction, issues related to learning disabilities and the mildly handicapped, evaluation of training and continuing education needs, and an assessment procedures survey. Rate of participation was very high, over 80% in the practitioner samples, 94% in the leadership sample, and 73% in the university faculty sample.

Demographic results indicated that practitioner school psychologists are increasingly women (60% to 65%); have a median age of about 38, and have about 9 years of experience. Most practitioners, 70% or more, have at least the specialist degree or the equivalent and about 20% have doctoral degrees. The overwhelming majority, about 90%, is employed in public school settings where their median salary is about $28,500. In contrast, the NASP leadership is more evenly divided between men and women, is slightly older than the practitioner sample, has more years of experience, is more likely to hold a doctoral rather than a specialist degree, and has a median salary of about $34,000. The university faculty sample was older, median age = 44, about 75% male, with a salary of $37,500 that is often supplemented with private practice or consulting income.

The extensive array of items on school psychology credentialing indicated that both the leadership and practitioner samples strongly support the current NASP position concerning nondoctoral credentialing. In some instances, the support of the NASP leadership for these traditional positions was slightly lower than support from the practitioner sample. University faculty were less committed to non-doctoral credentialing.

Items pertaining to issues in learning disabilities, and appropriate programs for low achieving and mildly handicapped elicited similar responses from the groups. The leadership sample was generally slightly more critical of current practices and somewhat more committed to development of alternative delivery systems.

A parallel set of items was used to obtain practitioner ratings of training and continuing education needs and university faculty evaluations of current training quality and needs for improving their graduate program. The results were very similar with both groups indicating needs to improve in the areas of neuropsychology, interventions in regular education for students with behavioral or emotional problems, and regular education interventions for students with learning problems.

One of the practitioner samples and university faculty were asked to indicate frequency of use or extent of supervised practice, respectively, of an extensive list of assessment instruments/procedures. Again, the results were very similar with both groups indicating highest emphasis on the Wechsler Scales, unstructured interview, the Bender, the WRAT, the Draw-A-Person, and the Woodcock-Johnson Achievement Battery.

OVERVIEW

The 1986 NASP Survey was conducted to establish reliable information on issues crucial to the organization, e.g., office structure, priorities, and spring meeting reimbursement, and to the profession of school psychology, e.g., continuing education needs, job satisfaction, credentialing preferences, and attitudes/beliefs on LD issues. In addition, demographic information, last collected on a random sample of NASP members in about 1981, was needed for various committees and as a basis for policy deliberations. In many instances, contrasts between the NASP leadership and NASP member practitioners were examined.

The content for the 1986 NASP Survey was developed through reviews of previous surveys and invitations to NASP officials to contribute ideas. A memo requesting suggestions for content was sent in August, 1985, to all persons in the NASP leadership, defined as officers, regional directors, delegates, and committee chairs. During August and the first two weeks of September, we constructed a draft of the survey based on our review of previous surveys and the suggestions from the NASP leadership. This draft was mailed to the NASP leadership on September 16, 1985. Comments and suggestions were again encouraged. Several persons in the NASP leadership did provide written comments and additional comments were obtained from various persons at the Fall Delegate Assembly/Executive Board meeting in Chicago September 27-29, 1985. The final draft of the survey was developed in early October, 1985. Copies of the four surveys are provided in Appendices A, B, C, & D.

One outcome of the concerted effort to obtain comments and suggestions from everyone in the NASP leadership was a very lengthy survey that was far too long to be reasonable for individuals to complete. In attempting to reduce the length it became apparent that much of the content was directed at practitioner members rather than the NASP leadership. We then decided to develop two overlapping versions of the practitioner survey and to select two random samples of practitioners. This resulted in the study of four groups: Two practitioner samples, the NASP leadership, and a university faculty sample.

The same demographic information was obtained with the four groups. Different information was obtained on subsequent portions of the survey. In the various results that follow, it is important for the reader to keep in mind that two practitioner samples were used. Typically, there are results for one, but not both of the practitioner samples. The major exception was demographic information which, as mentioned before, was collected for all four samples. We have attempted to clearly indicate the sample on which various results are based in the narrative and in all tables.

The practitioner samples were selected in mid-October, 1985. Michael Chrin, NASP Executive Manager for Membership and Fiscal Services, was in charge of choosing the random sample. We requested a 10% sample of the total NASP membership, which in mid-October was approximately 6,200 persons. We requested selection of a sample of 620, stratified by geographic region. The final sample was exactly proportional to the regional composition of NASP membership. Further, we requested that the sample be restricted to practitioner members, thus excluding student members or members employed in university settings.

The original practitioner sample of N = 620 was randomly assigned by us to the first or the second practitioner sample. The names on this roster were then carefully examined by the senior author. Persons known to be involved in university faculty positions were deleted. This procedure yielded a total of 308 and 305 in the first and second practitioner samples, respectively.

The two forms of the practitioner questionnaire were mailed to participants on October 30, 1985. A cover letter signed by two of us (Reschly and Genshaft) encouraged persons to respond as soon as possible and stressed the importance of this information. A postage paid envelope was also included with the survey. Ten days after the original survey was mailed, a reminder postcard was sent to every participant from whom a completed survey had not yet been received. This reminder postcard further encouraged persons to complete the survey and mail the results as soon as possible. Approximately three weeks after the original survey was mailed, a complete packet with a new cover letter was sent to all persons from whom completed surveys had not been obtained. This cover letter again urged persons to complete the survey, stressed the importance of the information, and urged a prompt response.

The NASP leadership received a questionnaire of approximately the same length as the two practitioner questionnaires, with content often identical to corresponding sections in the practitioner versions. Content identical to sections on one or the other of the practitioner forms was included in the areas of NASP priorities, meeting reimbursement, credentialing (including licensure), and LD issues. This identical content made direct comparisons between the NASP leadership and a practitioner sample possible.

The NASP leadership was defined as persons involved as officers, regional directors, delegates, or committee chairs during the 1984-85 and 1985-86 years. In addition, all past officers were included in the NASP leadership study. This had the effect of including all of the executive managers, all of whom served in one or more elected offices prior to their appointment as an executive manager. A total of 139 persons were part of the NASP leadership using these criteria.

The surveys were mailed to persons in the NASP leadership in mid-November, 1985. Approximately ten days later the reminder postcard was sent to all persons not returning a completed survey. Approximately three weeks after the original survey was mailed, another survey with a new cover letter was mailed to all non-respondents.

The university faculty survey was conducted in March-May, 1986. Participants were selected from persons listed as primary faculty in the Directory of School Psychology Training Programs (Brown & Minke, 1984). A table of random numbers was used to determine the starting point, after which every fourth name was selected as a participant yielding a sample of 166. The same procedures were used, i.e., initial survey followed by a reminder postcard with, when necessary, a new survey mailed about three weeks after the distribution of the original survey.

RESULTS

Sample Size/Return Rate

The results from the four surveys with a brief narrative will be provided in this section. Perhaps the most remarkable result was the return rate which was considerably above comparable surveys reported in the school psychology literature. The original sample of 310 for the practitioner I or the "green" form sample, was reduced to 305 because two persons on the original sample were on university faculties rather than in practitioner roles and three surveys were returned because the participant was either deceased or had left the field of school psychology. A total of 260 of the possible 305 completed surveys were returned, yielding a participation rate of 85% in the first practitioner (green form) sample.

There was a total of 300 in the second practitioner sample (blue form), of which 242 or 81% participated. Ten persons in the original sample of 310 were eliminated because they no longer were in school psychology, were deceased, or were not practitioners at the time the survey was distributed. The return rate for the NASP leadership was 94%, based on 131 of 139 surveys completed by participants.

The university faculty sample consisted of 166 persons chosen from the list of primary faculty (N = 664) in the Directory (Brown & Minke, 1984). Two persons selected were deleted because they had participated in the NASP leadership sample. Ten additional persons did not participate because they were no longer in school psychology, had left university employment, or moved with no forwarding address. Deletions for these reasons yielded a total sample of 154, of which 113 completed the lengthy questionnaire. The participation rate of 73% compares very favorably with other similar surveys of university faculty.

The original university faculty sample included faculty from 161 of the 211 programs listed in the Directory. There were two participants from 16 of these programs and three participants from two programs. The results of this survey should be seen as representing university faculty, not programs as such.

The high participation rate in this study was obtained through application of methods developed primarily in other social sciences, particularly sociology, for improving rate of participation in survey research. Although the procedures adopted for this study can involve up to three separate mailings to each participant, the overall cost is relatively modest because a smaller sample can be selected. In contrast to other survey research in school psychology, which typically obtains a return rate of about 40% to 50%, the return rate in this study was far higher. Inferences based on a very high rate of participation of a randomly selected sample are more valid than inferences based on a relatively low percent of returns from a very large sample, even if that large sample constitutes the entire population. The methodology applied here should be used in future survey research in school psychology. The overall cost is probably lower and the results are far more likely to accurately represent the population of interest.

Table 1: Return Rate

Sample	Practitioner I (Green Form)	Practitioner II (Blue Form)	Leadership (Yellow Form)	Faculty (Salmon Form)
Number Returned	260	242	131	113
Total Sample	305	300	139	154
Percent	85%	81%	94%	73%

Age and Sex

Data on the age and sex of participants in the four samples are summarized in Table 2. Data on age were gathered by asking participants to check one of six age groups. The frequency and percentage of each sample in the six age groups is provided in Table 2. These data provide the basis to estimate, but not to determine exactly, the median age for each of the samples.

Table 2: Age

Sample	Practitioner I (Green Form)		Practitioner II (Blue Form)		Leadership (Yellow Form)		Faculty (Salmon Form)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age								
< 25	2	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%
25-34	90	35%	77	32%	33	25%	9	8%
35-44	100	38%	101	42%	58	45%	49	43%
45-54	44	17%	41	17%	27	21%	29	26%
55-64	22	9%	20	8%	12	9%	23	20%
≥ 65	2	1%	2	1%	0	0%	3	3%
	260		242		130		113	

The median age of each of the samples was estimated from an ogive with age plotted on the abscissa and relative cumulative percent on the ordinate. The estimated median age for both practitioner samples was 38. The estimated median ages for the NASP leadership and university faculty samples were 39.5

and 44, respectively. These estimated medians are further supported by inspection of the data in Table 2 where it is clear that the median age for all four samples must be in the interval 35-44 years. Other methods of estimating 0 specific parameters from group data might yield slightly different estimates, but any such estimates would by necessity have to be in the 35-44 interval. The data in Table 2 indicate that very few school psychologists are under age 25 and that substantial numbers are in the age range of 25-44. The relatively recent origin of school psychology in some states as well as the enormous expansion of school psychology over the past ten years in nearly all states is reflected in the distribution of age. There are relatively few, about 25% to 30% of practicing school psychologists, in the adjacent ten-year intervals for age 45-64.

Table 3: Sex

Sample	Practitioner I (Green Form)		Practitioner II (Blue Form)		Leadership (Yellow Form)		Faculty (Salmon Form)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Sex								
Male	90	35%	97	40%	67	52%	84	74%
Female	168	65%	144	60%	63	48%	29	26%
	258		241		130		113	

The sex distribution in the four samples is presented in Table 3. The practitioner samples were 60% to 65% female while the leadership sample was 48% female. In contrast, the university faculty sample was 74% to 26%, male to female. These data reflect the increasing proportion of women in school psychology practitioner roles, a phenomenon observed in earlier surveys of training programs and for psychology graduate programs in general. Although women are clearly the majority of practitioners, they are underrepresented to a moderate degree in the NASP leadership and to a significant degree in university faculty.

Experience and Teaching Background

Experience in school psychology is summarized in Table 4. Both of the practitioner samples had approximately nine years experience as school psychologists. The leadership sample had significantly more experience, approximately 12.5 years or about 3 1/2 more years than the practitioner sample. The university faculty sample had a mean of 6.64 years of experience as a school psychologist. The average experience on a university faculty was 14.18 with a sd = 7.92. The range of experience for all samples was from 0 to about 30 years.

Table 4: Years of Experience as a School Psychologist

Sample	Practitioner I (Green Form)	Practitioner II (Blue Form)	Leadership (Yellow Form)	Faculty (Salmon Form)
Mean	8.71	9.19	12.57	6.64
Standard Deviation	5.40	5.99	6.04	7.00
Range	0-30	1-34	1-28	0-31

Participants were also asked to respond to several items related to teaching certification and teaching experience. These data are summarized in Tables 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9.

Table 5: Teaching Certificate

Sample	Practitioner I (Green Form)		Practitioner II (Blue Form)		Leadership (Yellow Form)		Faculty (Salmon Form)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	126	49%	107	45%	61	47%	58	52%
No	133	51%	132	55%	69	53%	54	48%
	259		239		130		112	

Table 6: Area of Teaching Certification for Those with a Teaching Certificate

Sample	Practitioner I (Green Form)		Practitioner II (Blue Form)		Leadership (Yellow Form)		Faculty (Salmon Form)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Area Certified								
Elementary (E)	38	30%	36	33%	14	22%	14	25%
Secondary (S)	42	33%	34	31%	27	42%	20	35%
Special Education (Sp Ed)	7	6%	10	9%	4	6%	6	10%
E & S	13	10%	8	7%	8	13%	6	10%
E & Sp Ed	14	11%	14	13%	4	6%	4	7%
S & Sp Ed	6	5%	5	5%	4	6%	6	10%
E, S, Sp Ed	6	5%	2	2%	3	5%	1	2%
Total	126		109		64		57	
None (no certificate)	(133)		(132)		(69)		(56)	

Approximately half of the participants in all of the samples indicated they possessed a teaching certificate (see Table 5). Data on certification areas, i.e., secondary, elementary, special edcation, or some combination of these, are reported in Table 6. The percentages in Table 6 pertain to those persons with teaching certificates, not to the entire sample. For example, the 30% in the Practitioner I sample is based on the 38 persns with elementary certificates out of the 126 with teaching certificates, not the total sample of 259 answering this item.

Participants in all four samples were also asked to indicate whether they had taught on a full-time basis. If "yes," they were further requested to indicate level and years of experience. Data on teaching experience as well as the level and years of experience are provided in Tables 7 and 8. About half of the participants indicated at least some full-time teaching experience. The level of teaching experience was quite varied with considerable representation of elementary, secondary, and special education experience (see Table 8). The average number of years of full-time teaching experience, for those persons indicating teaching experience, was about 5.5 years for the NASP practitioner and leadership samples, and 3.61 for the university faculty sample (see Table 9).

Table 7: Teaching Experience

Sample	Practitioner I (Green Form)		Practitioner II (Blue Form)		Leadership (Yellow Form)		Faculty (Salmon Form)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	122	48%	106	44%	65	52%	49	46%
No	135	52%	132	55%	61	48%	58	54%

Table 8: Kind of Teaching Experience

Sample	Practitioner I (Green Form)		Practitioner II (Blue Form)		Leadership (Yellow Form)		Faculty (Salmon Form)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Kind								
Elementary (E)	39	35%	31	35%	14	23%	6	20%
Secondary (S)	34	31%	27	31%	17	27%	14	47%
Special Education (Sp Ed)	13	12%	11	13%	19	31%	2	7%
E & S	10	9%	7	8%	5	8%	2	7%
E & Sp Ed	9	8%	7	8%	2	3%	2	7%
S & Sp Ed	4	4%	5	6%	5	8%	4	13%
E, S, & Sp Ed	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	110		88		62		30	
None	(135)		(132)		(61)		(83)	

Table 9: Years Taught

Sample	Practitioner I (Green Form)	Practitioner II (Blue Form)	Leadership (Yellow Form)	Faculty (Salmon Form)
Mean	5.62	5.29	5.54	3.61
Standard Deviation	5.35	5.83	4.29	2.55
Range	1-27	1-32	1-18	1-11

Degree, Employment, and Income

Data on the highest degree held by participants in the NASP practitioners and leadership groups are presented in Table 10. The overwhelming majority of school psychologists in these three samples possess graduate degrees at the Specialist Degree level or above. However, only 20% of the practitioner sample hold doctoral degrees. In contrast, slightly over half of the NASP leadership have earned doctoral degrees. This difference in level of graduate education may be important in understanding differences reported later concerning issues in credentialing.

Table 10: Highest Degree

Sample	Practitioner I (Green Form)		Practitioner II (Blue Form)		Leadership (Yellow Form)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
MA (30 hours)	9	4%	11	5%	1	1%
MA (45 hours)	69	27%	56	23%	18	14%
Specialist level	127	50%	123	51%	36	28%
Doctoral	51	20%	51	21%	72	56%

Participants in the practitioner samples were also asked to indicate type of community, urban, suburban, rural, or some combination. As can be seen in Table 11, about 35% to 40% of school psychologists in these samples were in rural areas, clearly indicating that rural school psychologists are not a small minority of practitioners. Identical percentages of participants in both samples indicated they were located in urban and suburban communities, 22% and 24%, respectively. The remaining respondents practiced in some combination of urban, suburban, and rural.

Table 11: Type of Community

Sample	Practitioner I (Green Form)		Practitioner II (Blue Form)	
	N	%	N	%
Community Type				
Urban	57	22%	53	22%
Suburban	61	24%	57	24%
Rural	90	35%	97	40%
Combination	49	19%	33	14%
Total	257		240	

Data on the primary employment setting, public school, private practice, institutional/residential, university, or some other setting, were obtained for the three NASP samples. The results are summarized in Table 12. The overwhelming majority of practitioners were employed in public school settings, nearly 90%. These results do lend support to the observation that the overwhelming majority of practitioners are employed in public school settings. Slightly over 10% of both practitioner samples were employed in other settings, including 3% in private practice, about 3% in institutional/residential settings, and about 7% to 8% in some other setting which usually was a combination of private practice and public school settings. The most frequent employment setting for the leadership sample was public school with a substantial number (about 30%) in university settings. Clearly, the most common setting for school psychology practitioners, as well as for persons in

---

Table 12: Primary Employment Setting

Sample	Practitioner I (Green Form)		Practitioner II (Blue Form)		Leadership (Yellow Form)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Primary Employment Setting						
Public Schools	233	89%	211	87%	62	48%
Private Practice	7	3%	7	3%	-	-
Institutional/ Residential	4	2%	6	3%	-	-
University	0	0%	0	0%	41	31%
Other	18	7%	18	8%	27	21%

---

the NASP leadership, is the public school. However, some school psychologists are employed in a number of other settings.

Further information was requested from participants in each of the practitioner samples concerning the ratio of school psychologists to students, the percent of minority students in their student population, and whether or not they were involved with a special assignment. Data on these variables are summarized in Tables 13, 14, and 15.

The vast improvement in the ratio of school psychologists to students in the past decade is apparent in data presented in Table 13. The estimated median ratio of students to school psychologists for both samples was 1750:1. The median was estimated through construction of an ogive from the grouped data presented in Table 13. However, the enormous expansion of special education programs, particularly for the mildly handicapped, has likely reduced the benefits of increased ratios by further limiting time available to regular education students. This interpretation is supported by information presented later concerning the amount of time devoted to special education services.

Respondents were also asked to indicate the percent of minority students in the student population they served. Results in Table 14 indicate that about half of all school psychologists are assigned to student populations with 5% or fewer minority students. In contrast, only about 10% of school psychologists serve student populations involving greater than 50% minority enrollment. However, about 40% of all school psychologists serve populations with

Table 13: Student/Psychologist Ratio

Sample	Practitioner I (Green Form)		Practitioner II (Blue Form)	
	N	%	N	%
Student Numbers				
≤ 1000	45	19%	38	16%
1000-1500	43	18%	54	23%
1501-2000	59	24%	48	21%
2001-2500	29	12%	32	14%
2501-3000	28	12%	30	13%
3001-3500	12	5%	6	3%
3501-4000	12	5%	9	4%
4001-5000	11	5%	7	3%
≥ 5001	3	1%	8	3%
Total	242		232	

significant percentages (over 10%) of minority students. Services to address the unique needs of minority students are therefore an important concern for school psychologists. Practitioner and faculty opinions regarding minority issues in training and service delivery are discussed later in this report (see Tables 40-43).

Table 14: Percentage of Minority Students

Sample	Practitioner I (Green Form) N	Practitioner I (Green Form) %	Practitioner II (Blue Form) N	Practitioner II (Blue Form) %
Minority Percentage				
0%	29	13%	12	5%
1- 5%	85	38%	85	39%
6- 10%	17	8%	28	13%
11- 20%	28	12%	28	13%
21- 30%	19	8%	22	10%
31- 50%	28	12%	24	11%
51- 75%	11	5%	10	5%
76-100%	8	4%	9	4%
Total	225		218	

In Table 15, data are summarized concerning special assignments, defined as spending 25% or more time with a specific type of handicapped student. These kinds of special assignments typically involve low incidence-severely handicapped students such as severely and profoundly retarded, deaf, blind, and so on. Although the results varied to some extent across the two practitioner samples, it appears that about 20% of all school psychologists do have a special assignment of this nature.

Table 15: Special Assignment Involving 25% or More of Time with Specific Type of Handicapped Student

Sample	Practitioner I (Green Form) N	Practitioner I (Green Form) %	Practitioner II (Blue Form) N	Practitioner II (Blue Form) %
Special Assignment				
Yes	46	18	57	24
No	208	82	178	76
Total	254		235	

Information reflecting the annual salary paid by participants' primary employers is summarized in Table 16. Median salaries for the two practitioner samples, the NASP leadership, and the university faculty sample were estimated using the ogive procedure described earlier. The median salary for both of the practitioner samples was $28,500. The median salaries for the NASP leadership and the university faculty sample were $34,000 and $37,500, respectively. It is important to note that most of the data were collected in November and December, 1985, and would, for nearly all participants, reflect salaries for the 1985-86 academic year.

The differences in salary between the NASP leadership and practitioner samples probably reflects a number of influences, including the greater number of years of experience for the NASP leadership, the higher proportion of participants in the leadership sample with doctoral degrees, and, perhaps, differences in primary employment setting. As noted in a previous table, the primary employment setting for the practitioner samples was nearly always public schools (90%). In contrast, about half of the persons in the NASP leadership were employed in settings other than the public schools, including 31% in university settings where the median salary was higher.

Table 16: Annual Salary Paid by Primary Employer

Sample	Practitioner I		Practitioner II		Leadership		[1]Faculty	
	(Green Form)		(Blue Form)		(Yellow Form)		(Salmon Form)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Salary								
< 13,000	2	1%	3	1%	4	3%	0	0%
13-18,999	11	4%	15	6%	1	1%	0	0%
19-24,999	73	28%	59	24%	15	12%	6	6%
25-29,999	68	26%	57	24%	28	21%	22	20%
30-34,999	49	20%	56	23%	25	19%	18	16%
35-39,999	31	12%	43	18%	28	21%	17	15%
40-44,999	16	7%	4	2%	12	9%	19	17%
45-49,999	2	1%	2	1%	10	8%	16	14%
≥ 50,000	2	1%	3	1%	6	5%	13	12%
Total	254		242		129		111	

[1] Of the 13 faculty participants with salaries over $50,000, 9 were in the $50-$54,999 interval; 2 in the $55-$59,999; and 1 each in the $60-$64,999 and over $65,000 intervals.

Further data were collected to determine if participants were engaged in additional employment beyond their positions with a primary employer.

Information in Tables 17 and 18 indicate that about one third of the practitioner sample were employed outside of their primary jobs, but about 60% of the NASP leadership and 75% of the faculty were involved in outside employment. These differences may again reflect the differences in primary employment setting for the practitioner samples and the NASP leadership as well as the greater proportion of doctoral degrees (and licensure) in the NASP leadership. University employment often allows some time for consulting activities, an opportunity capitalized on by most of the faculty sample.

Table 17: Additional Employment Beyond Primary Job

Sample	Practitioner I (Green Form)		Practitioner II (Blue Form)		Leadership (Yellow Form)		Faculty (Salmon Form)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Other Employment								
Yes	90	35%	80	34%	74	57%	80	75%
No	165	65%	156	66%	54	42%	26	25%

The kind of outside employment summarized in Table 18. It should be noted that responses in Table 18 are restricted to those persons engaged in outside employment (see Table 17), not the entire sample.

Table 18: Kind of Additional Employment

Sample	Practitioner I (Green Form)		Practitioner II (Blue Form)		Leadership (Yellow Form)		Faculty (Salmon Form)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Private Practice	47	52%	43	57%	14	19%	19	22%
Teaching	12	13%	13	17%	9	12%	13	15%
Consulting	13	14%	8	11%	9	12%	6	7%
Other/Combination	19	19%	11	15%	43	57%	47	56%
Total	91		75		75		85	

The kind of outside employment in the two practitioner samples was highly similar with over half involving private practice. Other kinds of outside employment included teaching, consulting, or some combination of private practice, teaching, or consulting. In contrast, the NASP leadership which had a considerably higher proportion indicating outside employment (see Table 17) was involved typically in some combination of private practice, teaching, and consulting.

The amount of outside income and whether the participant's income as a school psychologist was the primary household income are indicated in Tables 19 and 20. The amount of outside income varies considerably within each of the samples. In interpreting these data it is also important to keep in mind that 10% of the practitioner samples and nearly 25% of the NASP leadership refused to disclose the approximate amount of outside income. These persons may have substantial outside incomes not reflected in the results here. It is also important to bear in mind that the percentages presented in Table 19 are applicable only to those persons who do have outside income. In both of the practitioner samples, a clear majority indicated that they did not have outside income from additional employment. If we define a modest amount of outside income as greater than $1,000, then about 25% of both of the practitioner samples (using all participants, not just those answering "yes" to having outside income) had a modest level of outside income. And some persons had substantial outside incomes. In the NASP leadership, nearly half of all participants had at least a modest amount of outside income with a substantial number having relatively large outside incomes of over $5,000. Moreover, it is reasonable to believe that some of the persons who refused to disclose the amount of outside income would have higher rather than lower amounts of additional income. Clearly, outside income is earned by a substantial minority of practitioners and by over half of the NASP leadership.

Table 19: Amount of Outside Income

Sample	Practitioner I (Green Form)		Practitioner II (Blue Form)		Leadership (Yellow Form)		Faculty (Salmon Form)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Amount								
< $ 1,000	32	31%	27	31%	15	14%	10	11%
$1-$ 5,000	35	34%	30	34%	42	39%	26	29%
$5-$10,000	18	17%	15	17%	14	13%	17	19%
> $10,000	11	10%	8	9%	10	9%	33	37%
Refuse to Disclose	9	9%	8	9%	26	24%	3	3%
Total	105		88		107		89	

The outside income for the faculty sample was quite substantial in many instances. A total of 33 persons, constituting 37% of the 89 who had outside income, and 29% of the total participants (N = 113), reported outside income of over $10,000 per year. On the faculty form (see Appendix D) additional income intervals were provided for over $10,000. Eleven persons had outside incomes between $10,000 and $14,999; 7 were in the interval of $15,000 to $19,999; 3 were in the interval of $20,000 to $24,999; and 12 indicated incomes of over $25,000. After making certain to protect the identity of the individuals involved, ensuring their anonymity with us and everyone else, we then matched salary from primary employer with amount of outside income. The top earnings based on the combined sources of income was about $90,000; thirteen were in $65,000 to $85,000 range. These incomes, as well as the median faculty salary, indicate two conclusions: 1) Some faculty are doing very well and 2) The notion that faculty typically have lower salaries than pracitioners is a myth. Although the data concerning outside income from this study are quite imprecise, it is clear that outside income is a significant supplement to the primary employment salaries of many school psychologists. Furthermore, the outside income may further supplement a total household income which, as indicated in Table 20, often involves a second income from another household member.

The income of participants in these samples was frequently supplemented with a second income and, in a substantial minority of cases, the school psychologist's income was secondary to another income. The trend toward substan-tial amounts of additional income equal to or perhaps greater than the school psychologist's income was especially prominent in the two practitioner samples where about 50% of all respondents were in households where the school psychologist's income was equal to or secondary to another income. The faculty and NASP leadership household income characteristics were different. In those samples, the school psychologist's income was far more likely to the principal source of income for the household and was rarely secondary to another (and perhaps lower) source of income. This may, in part, reflect gender differences

Table 20: Income as School Psychologist and Total Household Income

Sample	Practitioner I (Green Form)		Practitioner II (Blue Form)		Leadership (Yellow Form)		Faculty (Salmon Form)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
School Psychology Salary is:								
Principal Source	128	50%	106	44%	75	61%	70	63%
Equal to Another Source	69	27%	66	28%	39	32%	33	30%
Secondary to Another Source	61	24%	68	28%	9	7%	8	7%
Total	258		240		123		111	

in the practitioner, leadership, and faculty samples. Salaries earned by women are more often secondary to incomes earned by men, particularly in households with two wage earners.

NASP Priorities

One of the most important purposes of this survey was to seek further guidance from NASP members and the NASP leadership concerning priorities for the organization. A set of 15 statements were developed by persons in the NASP leadership and the investigators. These 15 statements were designed to reflect important services, programs, or activities that currently are or that might be major priorities.

Respondents in two of the four samples, the Practitioner I (Green Form) and the NASP Leadership were asked to rate the NASP priorities as per the following directions.

"In your opinion, how important are the following NASP services and activities? Please circle the number which corresponds to your rating where..."

1	2	3	4	5	No Opinion
Crucial Top Priority		Moderate Importance		Low Priority Less Important	/ /

The means, standard deviations, and number and percent of no opinion responses are provided in Table 21.

Table 21: Practitioner and Leadership Evaluations of NASP Priorities

	Practitioner I (Green Form)			Leadership (Yellow Form)		
Priorities Statements	Mean	s.d.	No Op	Mean	s.d.	No Op
1) Development and implementation of standards for graduate programs	2.18	0.89	4(2%)	2.13	0.94	0(0%)
2) Public information and public relations activities	2.30	0.83	3(1%)	1.77	0.82	0(0%)
3) Liaison with other professional and advocacy groups	2.43	0.83	5(2%)	2.27	0.91	0(0%)

Table 21 (continued)

	Practitioner I (Green Form)			Leadership (Yellow Form)		
Priorities Statements	Mean	s.d.	No Op	Mean	s.d.	No Op
4) Assistance to State Associations of School Psychologists	2.27	0.92	4(2%)	1.93	0.86	0(0%)
5) Publications (Review and Communique)	(4th) 1.92	0.87	2(1%)	(3rd) 1.66	0.82	0(0%)
6) Publications and monographs (e.g., Practices in School Psychology)	1.97	0.90	3(1%)	1.86	0.86	0(0%)
7) Professional development training packages in various formats (written videotape, computer disk, etc.)	(5th) 2.33	1.06	5(2%)	2.27	0.95	0(0%)
8) Influencing state legislation, rules, regulations, and policy	(3rd) 1.76	0.85	2(1%)	(5th) 1.76	0.87	0(0%)
9) Development and promotion of quality standards for school psychology services in schools (ratios, support, etc.)	(1st) 1.74	0.80	4(2%)	(2nd) 1.56	0.67	0(0%)
10) Development and promotion of rights and opportunities in regard to licensure for private practice	2.20	1.08	3(1%)	2.88	1.23	0(0%)
11) Influencing Federal legislation rules, regulations, and policy	(2nd) 1.74	0.87	3(1%)	(1st) 1.55	0.79	0(0%)
12) Convention program and workshops	2.24	0.92	2(1%)	2.01	0.80	0(0%)

Table 21 (continued)

	Practitioner I (Green Form)			Leadership (Yellow Form)		
Priorities Statements	Mean	s.d.	No Op	Mean	s.d.	No Op
13) Providing opportunities to purchase professional liability insurance covering public and private practice	2.54	1.17	5(2%)	2.63	1.18	0(0%)
14) Providing opportunities for more involvement with international school psychology, e.g., sponsoring study tours	3.50	1.06	5(2%)	3.67	1.01	1(1%)
15) Promoting change in current delivery system such as non-categorical funding, increased development and use of regular education remedial options for the mildly handicapped, etc.	2.23	0.96	8(3%)	(4th) 1.74	0.85	3(2%)

Note: The top five priorities for each group are indicated by superscripts adjacent to the means. For example, Statement 5 was the 4th and 3rd priorities, respectively, for the Practitioner I and Leadership groups.

Nearly all of the statements were rated as being of at least moderate importance. The only exception was statement number 14, the importance of NASP providing opportunities for international school psychology involvement. The mean rating of priorities by the NASP leadership was generally slightly stronger, i.e., a lower number assigned indicating greater importance, than the practitioner sample. However, these differences were slight. Further indication of the relatively high agreement between the practitioner and leadership evaluations of priorities is provided by examining the highest rated priorities for both groups. The top five priorities for each sample were the same except for only two of the ten choices; Statement 5 concerning publications and monographs which was ranked the 5th highest priority by the practitioner sample but the 7th priority by the NASP leadership, and statement 15 concerning promotion of change in the current delivery system which was the 4th priority for the NASP leadership but considerably lower for the practitioner sample. Otherwise, the rank order of priorities among the two samples was virtually identical.

The very high degree of correspondence in ranking the priorities by practitioners and the NASP leadership certainly suggests that the current leadership is in touch with members of the organization. The only difference apparent in examining these rankings was the relative importance attached to promoting change in the current delivery system. A major position statement advocating such change has been passed by the NASP leadership. Change in the delivery system is also one of the most important goals in the NASP long-range plan. The position statement and the five-year plan are relatively recent, both developed in April-August, 1985. Although there has been little time to communicate with the membership on the priority of attempting to change the delivery system, that communication needs to be emphasized. Considerable attention should be devoted to providing the general membership with more information on this priority in order to ensure the continued close correspondence between member practitioner and leadership priorities for NASP.

Reimbursement for Convention Delegate Assembly/Executive Board

Several items were included to obtain practitioner (Green Form) and leadership opinions on reimbursement of the expenses incurred by the NASP leadership at the Spring governance meetings held during or just after the Annual Convention. A very brief summary of these results is provided here. Persons interested in detailed results can contact the senior author or the NASP Central Office for a supplement to this report.

A spirited debate on the reimbursement of Spring meeting expenses occurred at the 1985 Spring and Fall meetings. Due to the sharp division of opinion, action on various reimbursement resolutions was delayed pending the survey results from the practitioners and leadership samples. These results were presented at the 1986 Spring and Fall meetings where partial reimbursement of expenses was ultimately approved by the Delegate Assembly.

NASP Executive/Office Structure

One of the most important and far reaching issues considered by the NASP governance during the 1985-86 year had to do with the professional staff and office structure for the organization. The system used since 1976 involved four part-time executive managers, each of whom maintained at least part of what normally would be in a central office in their homes and in other rented space. A task force began discussions of possible changes in the management/office structure in January, 1985. These discussions have continued at the governance meetings over several years culminating in the implementation of a new management structure and a central office in January, 1987.

A number of items on the management/office structure were included on the practitioner and leadership forms. Most practitioners expressed uncertainty or no opinion on the majority of the items. The sentiment of the NASP leadership sample was complex, but generally supportive of the development of full-time staff and a single central office. At the same time, nearly everyone in the leadership expressed gratitude to the current managers for excellent service over the past decade. In short, the primary conclusion was that the part-time staff and decentralized office structure served NASP well, but the continued growth and increasing complexity of services required full-time staff and a central office. A more detailed presentation of these results is also available from the senior author or the NASP Central Office.

Public Relations and Policy Advocacy

The NASP Government and Professional Relations Committee suggested four items which were included on the Practitioner I (Green Form) Survey. The results on these four items are summarized in Table 22.

Table 22: NASP Practitioner's Involvement with Public Relations Policy Advocacy

			N	%
1) To what extent are you involved with the activities of NASP or state and local school psychology groups on legislation, standards, public relations, and advocacy?	Very Much	1	8	3%
		2	36	14%
	Some	3	43	17%
		4	70	27%
	Very Little	5	100	39%
2) Would you be willing to contact senators or members of congress?	Yes		190	73%
	No		10	4%
	Not Sure		60	23%
3) Would you be willing to inform other groups about school psychology by speaking at their meetings?	Yes		164	63%
	No		36	14%
	Not Certain		61	23%
4) How much time per week would you be willing to devote to school psychology public relations and policy advocacy work?	None		45	18%
	Up to 1 hour		122	48%
	1-2 hours		75	30%
	Over 2 hours		11	4%

Responses to the first item on current involvement with the public relations or policy advocacy activities of school psychology organizations indicated relatively little involvement for most school psychologists. The responses to this item indicated that about one-third have some involvement with these activities, leaving two-thirds with virtually no involvement. Responses to the next two items which provided examples of the kinds of public relations or policy advocacy activities that might involve school psychologists indicated that the overwhelming majority of school psychologists would be willing to contact senators or members of congress, and that most would be willing to inform other groups by speaking at their meetings. However, it appears that most (about two-thirds of respondents) would prefer to limit their involvement with public relations and policy advocacy activities to no more than one hour per week. These results suggest a potential enormous reservoir of presently underutilized talent with respect to public relations and policy advocacy, but the amount of time that most persons are willing to commit is quite limited. Development of procedures to capitalize on this available talent, within the confines of the limited time commitments, may well be one of the most important challenges for the NASP leadership.

Computer Access and Use

A series of items suggested by the NASP Committee on Computer and Technological Applications to School Psychology dealt with access to and use of microcomputers. These items were included on the Practitioner I (Green Form) survey.

The results in Table 23 concerning computer access and use indicate that most practicing school psychologists (62%) have easy access to a microcomputer in their work setting, most often, an Apple Microcomputer. However, most do not have access to a microcomputer at home. For those who do have access to a microcomputer at home (about one-third), the brand of the computer is usually, again, in the Apple series. The overwhelming majority of practitioner school psychologists do not have access to a modem, either at home or at work, and most do not have access to Special Net. For those persons who are using microcomputer, the top three choices among a fairly extensive list of possible uses was requested. The top three choices were word processing, test analysis, and report writing. Secondary uses were in the areas of data base, statistical, research, and graphing techniques.

These results indicate that most school psychologists could be using computer technology, at least at their work setting. However, extensive uses of computer technology such as those requiring a modem or access to special services like Special net are, at present, limited.

School Psychology Credentialing (Licensure)

Credentialing issues, including certification to practice in the public schools and licensure for private practice, have been, and continue to be, very prominent in discussions among school psychologists. For nearly 10 years, NASP has endorsed the Specialist Degree level plus the one-year internship as the basic entry level for the practice of school psychology in either the public or private sector. This position is in conflict with the official stance of the American Psychological Association (APA) which advocates the doctorate as well as the full-time internship as the minimum entry level for the practice of school psychology.

Table 23: Computer Access and Use

		N	%
Do you have easy access to a microcomputer in your work setting?	Yes	160	62%
	No	98	38%
If yes, brand of computer at work.	Apple	107	64%
	IBM	15	9%
	TRS80	6	4%
	Commodore	4	2%
	Other	6	4%
	Combination	29	17%
Do you have access to a computer at home?	Yes	79	31%
	No	179	69%
If yes, what is the brand? (of the computer at home)	Apple	26	32%
	IBM	15	18%
	TRS80	8	10%
	Commodore	14	17%
	Other	18	22%
	Combination	1	1%
Do you have a modem?	Yes (Home)	17	7%
	Yes (Work)	33	14%
	Yes (Both)	2	1%
	No	188	78%
Do you have access to Special Net?	Yes	41	18%
	No	182	82%
Current Uses of Computer	Word Processing	119	32%
	Test Analysis	75	20%
	Report Writing	81	21%
	Graphing	7	2%
	Counseling	3	1%
	Data Base	40	11%
	Spread Sheet	8	2%
	Research	5	1%
	Statistics	12	3%
	Software Review	3	1%
	Academic Remediation	8	2%
	Management	4	1%
	Other/Not Listed Above	12	3%
		377	

Items were developed and refined from the recommendations and comments of persons in the NASP leadership in the areas of: 1) current credentialing status; 2) opinions about credentialing; 3) reasons advanced for licensing being either important or unimportant; and 4) beliefs and attitudes as reflected in responses to a number of statements about credentialing. These results are summarized in the tables that follow.

A common set of items was included on three of the surveys, the Practitioner I (Green Form), the leadership, and faculty. The results reflecting current status and future intentions on credentialing are presented in Table 24. Results from the first two items indicate that nearly everyone in the practitioner and leadership groups were certified to provide services in school but that most were not licensed for private practice. Surprisingly, some 17% of persons designated as primary faculty in school psychology programs were not certified to practice in the schools. Licensure for private practice did vary across the three groups with about half of the NASP leadership and 74% of the faculty being licensed, but only about one-quarter of the practitioner sample holding the license. For those persons with private practice licensure, most held a license as a "generic" psychologist rather than a license that was specific to, and perhaps restricted to, school psychology. Those persons who are not currently licensed were asked to indicate whether they wished to be licensed for private practice in the future. Three-quarters of practitioners and NASP leadership groups (i.e., those persons who are not currently licensed)

Table 24: Current Status and Future Plans Concerning Licensure

		Practitioner I (Green Form)		Leadership (Yellow Form)		Faculty (Salmon Form)	
Item	Response	N	%	N	%	N	%
Are you certified to provide services as a school psychologist?	Yes	258	100%	122	95%	90	83%
	No	1	0%	6	5%	18	17%
Are you licensed for private practice?	Yes	72	28%	65	50%	79	74%
	No	189	72%	64	50%	28	26%
If licensed, what type of licensure?	Generic	46	68%	55	85%	66	88%
	Specific	22	32%	10	5%	9	12%
If not currently licensed do you wish to be licensed in the future?	Yes	122	78%	25	76%	12	55%
	No	34	22%	8	24%	10	45%

expressed the wish to be licensed in the future, but only half of the faculty not licensed now indicated wanting to be licensed in the future. Clearly, (and obviously) licensure for private practice is a significant issue and of considerable interest to the NASP groups.

Table 25: Current Status and Opinions on Nondoctoral Licensure

Item	Response	Practitioner I (Green Form) N	%	Leadership (Yellow Form) N	%	Faculty (Salmon Form) N	%
1) Do you believe nondoctoral school psychologists should be eligible for licensure?	Yes	220	86%	91	73%	46	45%
	No	37	14%	33	27%	56	55%
2) Can nondoctoral school psychologists be licensed in your state?	Yes	102	39%	49	38%	44	43%
	No	135	52%	75	58%	57	55%
	Don't know	23	9%	5	4%	2	2%
Are you licensed at the nondoctoral level now?	Yes	45	32%	15	23%	7	13%
	No	96	68%	51	77%	46	87%
3) If not currently licensed at the nondoctoral level, do you intend to seek nondoctoral licensing in the future?	Yes	44	55%	10	27%	2	10%
	No	36	45%	27	73%	19	90%

Item	[1]Sample	Extremely Important 1	2	3	Not at all 4	Important 5	$\bar{X}$	s.d.
4) How important is nondoctoral licensing for the profession of school psychology?	P	109(42%)	64(24%)	54(21%)	19(7%)	14(5%)	2.10	1.18
	L	21(16%)	44(34%)	32(25%)	23(18%)	8(6%)	2.63	1.14
	F	25(24%)	28(27%)	21(20%)	9(9%)	21(20%)	2.74	1.44
5) How important is nondoctoral licensing for you personally?	P	88(34%)	55(21%)	50(19%)	32(12%)	35(14%)	2.50	1.41
	L	11(9%)	14(11%)	24(19%)	22(17%)	58(45%)	3.79	1.34

The issue of nondoctoral licensure was explored with the groups using a variety of techniques and response formats. Results from questions seeking information on the current status as well as respondents' opinions on nondoctoral licensure are summarized in Table 25.

The overwhelming majority of practitioners and NASP leadership respondents strongly endorse nondoctoral licensure for school psychologists. However, there are differences between the two groups. These differences are apparent on items 1, 4, and 5 in Table 25, where respondents in the NASP leadership indicated slightly weaker support for nondoctoral licensure. It is important these differences not be exaggerated. In the leadership there is very strong support for nondoctoral licensure, but the support is not quite as strong as that indicated by practitioners. Generally, university faculty were less committed to nondoctoral licensing, but about half did endorse the traditional NASP position.

The attitudes and beliefs of the three groups were further studied with a set of 9 statements, most of which appeared earlier in a preliminary form pilot tested in about 1984. The strength of sentiment concerning the NASP and APA licensure positions and the possibility of a compromise were also assessed with these statements. In Table 26, the number and percent of responses at each point on the Likert Scale which ranged from Strongly Agree (1) to Strongly Disagree (5) are provided along with means and standard deviations for the Practitioner I (Green Form), Leadership, and Faculty Groups.

Table 26: Attitudes and Beliefs Concerning NASP and APA Licensure Standards

Item	[1]Sample	Strongly Agree 1	2	3	4	Strongly Disagree 5	$\bar{X}$	s.d.
1) Although I may not practice independently, it is important that I have the right to do so.	P	163(63%)	60(23%)	28(11%)	7(3%)	1(0%)	1.54	0.82
	L	64(51%)	42(33%)	13(10%)	5(4%)	2(2%)	1.72	0.92
	F	59(55%)	21(20%)	15(14%)	4(4%)	8(8%)	1.89	1.23
2) The doctoral level is the appropriate entry level for private practice.	P	34(13%)	13(5%)	31(12%)	90(35%)	90(35%)	3.73	1.34
	L	21(16%)	21(16%)	20(16%)	35(27%)	32(25%)	3.28	1.42
	F	48(44%)	25(23%)	13(12%)	17(16%)	5(5%)	2.13	1.27
3) Resolution of the independent practice issue between NASP and APA is important.	P	84(33%)	103(40%)	49(19%)	13(5%)	9(3%)	2.07	1.01
	L	19(15%)	23(26%)	35(27%)	29(23%)	12(9%)	2.86	1.20
	F	37(35%)	41(38%)	19(18%)	5(5%)	5(5%)	2.07	1.07

Table 26 - Continued

Item	[1]Sample	Strongly Agree 1	2	3	4	Strongly Disagree 5	$\bar{X}$	s.d.
4) NASP spends too much time working toward independent practice for non-doctoral school psychologists.	P	13(5%)	18(7%)	64(25%)	75(29%)	87(34%)	3.79	1.13
	L	18(14%)	23(18%)	45(35%)	26(20%)	16(12%)	2.99	1.21
	F	31(29%)	22(21%)	27(26%)	19(18%)	7(7%)	2.52	1.27
5) The right to engage in private practice not relevant.	P	17(7%)	26(10%)	61(24%)	94(36%)	60(23%)	3.59	1.14
	L	20(16%)	35(28%)	24(19%)	32(25%)	16(13%)	2.91	1.29
	F	18(17%)	17(16%)	31(29%)	33(31%)	7(7%)	2.94	1.19
6) I would support a NASP decision to endorse the doctoral entry level for independent practice.	P	36(14%)	25(10%)	24(9%)	50(19%)	125(48%)	3.79	1.48
	L	31(24%)	22(17%)	14(11%)	25(20%)	36(28%)	3.10	1.57
	F	45(41%)	27(25%)	16(15%)	11(10%)	10(9%)	2.21	1.33
7) I could support a joint NASP/APA resolution supporting nondoctoral entry and private practice through 1995, at which time the doctoral level would become the entry level.	P	38(15%)	57(22%)	63(24%)	44(17%)	55(21%)	3.08	1.36
	L	26(20%)	36(28%)	28(22%)	13(10%)	25(20%)	2.80	1.40
	F	15(14%)	32(29%)	19(17%)	21(19%)	22(20%)	3.03	1.36
8) Nondoctoral practitioners do not have sufficient training to practice independently.	P	15(6%)	20(7%)	37(14%)	66(26%)	120(47%)	3.99	1.20
	L	9(7%)	32(25%)	22(17%)	28(22%)	37(29%)	3.41	1.32
	F	27(25%)	21(20%)	25(23%)	25(23%)	9(8%)	2.70	1.30
9) NASP should continue current positions regarding nondoctoral independent practice in both the public and private sectors.	P	63(25%)	52(21%)	95(38%)	28(11%)	10(4%)	2.41	1.09
	L	30(24%)	27(22%)	38(31%)	21(17%)	8(6%)	2.60	1.21
	F	9(9%)	17(17%)	33(32%)	21(20%)	23(22%)	3.31	1.24

---

[1] P = Practitioner, L = Leadership, F = Faculty

Several general conclusions seem apparent from these results. First, there was strong support in both NASP groups for the traditional NASP position concerning non-doctoral licensure. The only difference between the two groups was in strength of sentiment supporting the current NASP commitment to the nondoctoral level. On all items, the NASP leadership sample was slightly less extreme in supporting the traditional NASP position. These differences were, however, slight and should not be misinterpreted as suggesting a change in the current NASP position. The strength of sentiment on the part of the leadership, supported by even stronger sentiment among practitioner members, would appear to ensure continuation of the NASP commitment to the nondoctoral level. University faculty responded differently, indicating support for a doctoral entry level for private practice and support for changing the NASP position to the doctoral level (see items 2, 6, and 9). However, substantial numbers of the university faculty, usually one-third or more, supported the traditional NASP positions; a similar percentage of practitioners (37%) indicated support for a doctoral entry level in ten years (see item 7). Thus there is considerable range of opinion in all groups on these issues, but, as noted earlier, firm support now for the traditional NASP position. It will be interesting, as well as important to the profession, to monitor sentiment in various groups on these issues in the coming 5 years of this century.

Job Satisfaction/Time in Special Education

Several items concerning job roles, satisfaction, plans for the future, and the amount of time spent with special education services were included with the second practitioner sample (Blue Form). Inclusion of these items was prompted by frequent, informal, anecdotal reports of considerable job dissatisfaction among practitioner school psychologists. Concern about job dissatisfaction and expected high rate of turnover caused by persons leaving the profession of school psychology were discussed at the Spring Hill Symposium in 1980, among other places. Data in Table 27 indicate current satisfaction with school psychology as well as the degree to which respondents' roles matched their initial expectations.

Table 27: Current Satisfaction with School Psychology

		Extremely Satisfied			Not at all Satisfied		
		1	2	3	4	5	
1) How satisfied are you in your position as a school psychologist?	N	38	123	45	25	6	$\bar{X}$ =2.32
	%	16%	52%	19%	11%	3%	s.d.=0.95
2) How well does your current role as a school psychologist conform to your initial expectations?	N	46	86	50	46	9	$\bar{X}$ =2.52
	%	19%	36%	21%	19%	4%	s.d.=1.12

The data on current satisfaction indicate that a small percentage of current school psychologists appear to be not at all satisfied, about 13%, while 16% indicate extreme satisfaction and another 52% indicate what might be regarded as at least moderate satisfaction with their current position. Responses to the second item in Table 27 are slightly less positive, but still quite positive overall, reflecting the opinion that the current role for most practitioners does conform reasonably well to their initial expectations. Based on these results, it appears that about 75% of practitioner school psychologists were not surprised nor, apparently, disappointed in the nature of their role in applied settings. Although it is difficult to gauge the exact meaning and the depth of this sentiment, these results suggest that considerable work may be necessary to convince practitioners to change their roles to any substantial degree. This kind of change among practitioners is, however, a prerequisite to the kinds of changes in the delivery system endorsed by NASP in recent policy statements. However, another plausible interpretation, suggested by Carolyn Cobb, indicated that general satisfaction includes a lot more than specific job functions and practices. It may be possible for persons to be "generally satisfied," but also quite interested in changing specific activities. This, too, bears further attention in subsequent surveys.

Additional items were developed to estimate sentiment concerning the choice of school psychology as a career and the future plans of practitioners to continue with a career in school psychology. The results from these items (see Table 28) indicate the vast majority of current practitioners would choose school psychology again. However, 25% of the practitioner respondents indicated they would not choose school psychology again which is a clear indication that at least some dissatisfaction exists with the choice of school psychology. It is difficult to know the reasons for that dissatisfaction since

---

Table 28: Choice of and Future Plans to Practice School Psychology

		N	%
1) Would you choose school psychology as a career if you could make the choice again?	Yes	173	75%
	No	58	25%
2) Do you plan to continue to work as a school psychologist in the future?	No	11	5%
	1-3 years	39	17%
	4-6 years	43	18%
	7-9 years	24	10%
	Over 10 years	41	18%
	Until retirement	75	32%

---

only 13% indicated dissatisfaction with their current position according to results reported in Table 27. However, nearly 25% indicated their current role did not conform to their expectations which may, in part, explain the reason 25% practitioners indicated they would not choose school psychology if the choice could be made again.

The second item in Table 28 sought information on plans to continue in the school psychology career. These results indicated that only 5% did not plan to continue as a school psychologist in the future, but there was a significant additional percent who indicated they did not intend to continue in school psychology beyond three more years. If these data are taken at face value, they would support the conclusion that about 20%, or 1 in 5, of all school psychologists currently practicing will leave the profession within three years. However, leaving the profession might mean quite different things, from establishing an entirely different career outside of psychology and education to some alternative within professional psychology or an administrative position within an educational setting that is more comprehensive than school psychological services.

Participants in the practitioner sample were then asked to estimate the amount of time they spent with special education services. The item and the responses are presented in Table 29. These results indicate that the overwhelming majority of school psychologists (80%) spend over half of their time with special education services. According to the results in Table 26 nearly half of all school psychologists (49% of the respondents) spent more than 75% of their time in one aspect or another of special education, typically evaluations of reevaluations.

Table 29: Proportion of Time in Special Education

Item	Proportion of time	N	%
Please estimate the amount of time you spend with special education services, e.g., conducting preplacement evaluations, staffings, follow-ups on placements, and reevaluations	less than 10%	12	5%
	10-25%	16	7%
	26-50%	20	8%
	52-75%	73	31%
	76-90%	63	27%
	greater than 90%	52	22%

A final item asked participants to rank order a set of statements related to sources of satisfaction in their career as a school psychologist. The instructions for this item and the number, percent, and mean for each of the statements is presented in Table 30.

Table 30: Sources of Satisfaction for School Psychologists

Item Stem: Please rank order the following aspects of your professional position on the basis of the satisfaction that they provide, where 1=most satisfying and 7=least satisfying. That is, use each number on the same only once so that the items are ranked in terms of satisfaction from 1 to 7.

Reasons for Satisfaction	Mean	s.d.	Rank Order
a) positively influencing children and youth through assessment and interventions	1.84	1.31	First
b) positively influencing children and youth through influence on placement and programming decisions	2.54	1.43	Second
c) salary and benefits	4.82	1.50	Fifth
d) colleagues and professionals with whom you work	3.62	1.39	Third
e) working with the educational system	5.12	1.61	Sixth
f) work hours and extended time off in the summer	4.09	1.75	Fourth
g) status in the community	5.96	1.32	Seventh

School psychologists' choices of satisfaction were heavily oriented toward positively influencing children and youth through assessment, interventions, placement, and programming decisions. The third choice for source of satisfaction was colleagues and professionals with whom you work. The fourth was work hours and extended time off in the summer. The lowest ranking sources of satisfaction were status in the community, working within the educational system, and salary and benefits. These low ranking sources of satisfaction might be regarded as probable sources of dissatisfaction for many practitioners.

The overall results on job satisfaction are mixed. Clearly, most school psychologists are relatively well satisfied with their current positions and most intend to continue in school psychology for many years in the future. However, there is a substantial minority, perhaps 20% to 25%, that are dissatisfied and who intend to consider other careers within four or five years.

The role of this dissatisfaction in changing school psychology remains to be seen. Some dissatisfied persons may seek changes in the scope and nature of school psychological services, perhaps along the lines suggested in the NASP position paper on alternatives to the current system and in the long-term objective concerning alternative delivery systems. On the other hand, dissatisfied persons may gravitate to other careers or nonpractitioner school psycholgy careers. The nature and extent of dissatisfaction would appear to be a fruitful area of further inquiry in future surveys.

Issues Related to the Mildly Handicapped

In view of the enormous importance and long standing involvement of school psychologists with low achieving and/or mildly handicapped students, as well as the recent commitments of the organization to advocating development of alternative models for delivering services to these students, a number of statements were constructed around the seven key issues in this area. Statements 1 and 15 dealt with the concern over numbers of students now classified as learning disabled and whether these students were classified as LD in order to obtain services even though they were not really handicapped. Two items, 3 and 4, dealt with LD classification criteria. Three items, 2, 9, and 10, dealt with the relationship of learning disabilities to the other mildly handicapping categories, mild mental retardation and emotional disturbance/behavior disorder. The relationship between regular and special education, and changes in regular education pertaining to the development of a broader variety of options for students now classified as mildly handicapped, were examined in items 5, 7, 11, and 14. School psychologists' roles with the low achieving/mildly handicapped students were assessed with items 6 and 13. Finally, single items were written concerning overrepresentation of minority students (item 12) and the effectiveness of special education services for students classified as learning disabled (item 8)

A Likert Scale with numerical values from 1 to 5, anchored by 1 = Strongly Agree, 3 = Neutral, and 5 = Strongly Disagree, was provided for respondents to indicate their opinions or beliefs on the 15 items. These items were included on three of the surveys, the Practitioner II (Blue Form), NASP Leadership, and Faculty. Responses of the three groups are presented in Table 31.

Table 31: Issues Related to Services for Learning Disabled and Other Low Achieving Students

Statement		Strongly Agree 1 N %	2 N %	Neutral 3 N %	4 N %	Strongly Disagree 5 N %	$\bar{X}$	s.d.
		Number and Percent of Responses at Each Point on the Likert Scale						
1) Too many students are being classified as learning disabled and placed in special education.	P	57(24%)	95(40%)	36(15%)	38(16%)	11(5%)	2.37	1.15
	L	74(58%)	33(26%)	10(8%)	8(6%)	2(2%)	1.67	0.98
	F	32(30%)	39(36%)	22(21%)	10 (9%)	4(4%)	2.21	1.09

Table 31 - Continued

Statement		Strongly Agree 1 N %	2 N %	Neutral 3 N %	4 N %	Strongly Disagree 5 N %	$\bar{X}$	s.d.
2) The increase in learning disabled incidence is due in large part to reluctance to use the classifications of mild mental retardation or emotional disturbance/behavior disorder.	P	14(6%)	58(24%)	47(20%)	81(34%)	40(17%)	3.31	1.18
	L	18(14%)	35(27%)	17(13%)	39(31%)	19(15%)	3.05	1.32
	F	15(14%)	34(32%)	30(28%)	21(20%)	7(7%)	2.73	1.13
3) The requirement of a processing deficit should be added to or strengthened in the LD classification requirements.	P	52(22%)	80(34%)	56(24%)	27(11%)	22(9%)	2.52	1.22
	L	20(16%)	27(22%)	35(28%)	25(20%)	18(14%)	2.95	1.28
	F	19(18%)	39(36%)	21(20%)	14(14%)	13(12%)	2.66	1.27
4) LD classification should be based on the exclusion factors and severe discrepancy between achievement and ability.	P	29(12%)	89(38%)	53(23%)	38(16%)	23(10%)	2.73	1.17
	L	16(13%)	45(36%)	33(26%)	21(17%)	11(9%)	2.73	1.15
	F	8(8%)	44(43%)	27(27%)	12(12%)	11(11%)	2.75	1.11
5) Better regular classroom instruction would prevent many students from being classified as LD.	P	85(36%)	84(35%)	27(11%)	31(13%)	10(4%)	2.14	1.17
	L	77(60%)	38(30%)	8(6%)	3(2%)	2(2%)	1.55	0.84
	F	37(34%)	35(32%)	20(19%)	13(12%)	3(3%)	2.17	1.11
6) School psychologists should assist teachers in designing, implementing, and evaluating prereferral interventions before students are considered for LD classification.	P	118(49%)	90(38%)	18(8%)	7(3%)	5(2%)	1.70	0.89
	L	100(78%)	25(20%)	2(2%)	0(0%)	1(1%)	1.26	0.56
	F	65(60%)	36(33%)	5(5%)	2(2%)	0(0%)	1.48	0.68

Table 31 - Continued

Statement		Strongly Agree 1 N %	2 N %	Neutral 3 N %	4 N %	Strongly Disagree 5 N %	$\bar{X}$	s.d.
7) The delivery system needs to be changed so that remedial services can be provided without classifying students as learning disabled.	P	126(53%)	64(27%)	24(10%)	18(7%)	6(3%)	1.80	1.06
	L	84(67%)	30(24%)	3(2%)	7(6%)	2(2%)	1.52	0.91
	F	52(49%)	30(28%)	16(15%)	4(4%)	4(4%)	1.85	1.06
8) Special education services for students classified as learning disabled are usually quite effective.	P	11(5%)	65(27%)	86(36%)	60(25%)	17(7%)	3.03	1.00
	L	3(2%)	30(24%)	22(18%)	59(47%)	12(9%)	3.37	1.03
	F	2(2%)	9(9%)	40(38%)	44(42%)	11(10%)	3.50	0.86
9) The educational needs of students classified as learning disabled and mildly (educable) mentally retarded are very similar.	P	12(5%)	32(14%)	38(16%)	89(38%)	66(28%)	3.70	1.16
	L	5(4%)	40(32%)	16(13%)	46(37%)	19(15%)	3.27	1.18
	F	8(8%)	24(23%)	14(13%)	34(32%)	25(24%)	3.42	1.28
10) The educational needs of students classified as learning disabled and emotionally disturbed/behavior disordered are very similar.	P	6(3%)	35(15%)	30(13%)	103(43%)	63(26%)	3.77	1.08
	L	2(2%)	29(23%)	20(16%)	58(46%)	17(13%)	3.47	1.04
	F	5(5%)	15(15%)	21(20%)	35(34%)	27(26%)	3.62	1.64
11) Remedial and compensatory education from regular education, and special education programs for the mildly handicapped, should be merged (e.g., combine Chapter I and LD resource).	P	29(12%)	46(19%)	60(25%)	69(29%)	35(15%)	3.15	1.24
	L	18(14%)	45(36%)	38(30%)	17(14%)	7(6%)	2.60	1.07
	F	9(9%)	27(27%)	36(35%)	19(19%)	11(11%)	2.96	1.12

Table 31 - Continued

Statement		Strongly Agree 1 N %	2 N %	Neutral 3 N %	4 N %	Strongly Disagree 5 N %	$\bar{X}$	s.d.
12) Overrepresentation of minority students in special education programs for the mildly handicapped is discriminatory.	P	22(9%)	57(24%)	66(28%)	60(26%)	28(12%)	3.06	1.17
	L	18(14%)	34(27%)	25(20%)	31(25%)	17(14%)	2.96	1.29
	F	7(7%)	19(18%)	22(21%)	33(32%)	22(21%)	3.43	1.21
13) School psychologists are more effective if they concentrate on accurate and thorough diagnosis rather than assisting with or carrying out interventions.	P	6(3%)	22(9%)	23(10%)	85(36%)	101(43%)	4.07	1.06
	L	2(2%)	2(2%)	7(6%)	36(29%)	77(62%)	4.48	0.81
	F	3(3%)	6(6%)	9(9%)	38(37%)	48(46%)	4.17	1.01
14) It is important to maintain clear distinctions between special and regular education, and between slow learner-low achievers and learning disabled students.	P	26(11%)	57(24%)	39(17%)	68(29%)	46(19%)	3.22	1.31
	L	9(7%)	14(11%)	12(10%)	49(40%)	39(32%)	3.77	1.22
	F	9(9%)	21(21%)	14(14%)	28(28%)	30(29%)	3.48	1.34
15) Students are often classified as learning disabled so that service can be provided even though they are not really handicapped.	P	59(25%)	96(40%)	32(13%)	37(16%)	13(6%)	2.37	1.18
	L	62(49%)	49(39%)	5(4%)	7(6%)	3(2%)	1.73	0.95
	F	34(33%)	34(33%)	22(21%)	13(13%)	1(1%)	2.16	1.05

Means and standard deviations are presented in the right hand columns of the table. Means near the midpoint of the Likert Scale, from 2.5 to 3.5, were regarded as indicating neutral sentiment. Means which fell between 3.5 and 4.25 or between 1.75 and 2.5 were regarded as indicating disagreement and agreement, respectively. Means that were larger than 4.25 or smaller than 1.75

were interpreted as indicating strong disagreement and strong agreement, respectively. The absolute value between the two means on each item was seen as a rough indication of the degree of agreement between the practitioner sample and the NASP leadership. We acknowledge these interpretations of the numerical data are to some extent arbitrary, but, with the cautions expressed here, are useful in understanding these results.

The two items concerning the number of students in learning disability programs and the reason, "to obtain services" caused the largest absolute differences between the practitioner sample and the NASP leadership. On both of these items, the NASP leadership overall mean could be regarded as indicating strong agreement while the practitioner and faculty means indicated agreement. The absolute value between the means was .70 and .64 for items 1 and 15, respectively. All groups agreed with the statements, but the NASP leadership indicated strong agreement on both. The differences here suggest that practitioners are somewhat less convinced that, a) too many students are being classified as learning disabled, or, b) that substantial numbers of students who are not really learning disabled are classified as such in order to "obtain services."

The two items dealing with LD classification criteria, items 3 and 4, yielded mean scores for the groups within the range we regarded as indicating neutral sentiment. There were no differences at all between the two groups on item 4. The means on item 3 indicated the faculty and leadership groups were neutral concerning the addition of a processing deficit requirement but the practitioner sample mean was close to the point we established as indicating agreement. It should be noted that substantial numbers and percentages of persons in all groups chose all points on the Likert Scale for both of these items. Thus, the overall sentiment is neutral, but the range of sentiment is quite broad with, in all likelihood, some strong advocates of each of the different ways to modify the current classification criteria.

Perceptions and opinions concerning the relationship of learning disabilities to other mildly handicapping conditions, specifically behavior disorders/emotional disturbance and mild mental retardation, were assessed with items 2, 9, and 10. On item 2, which presented the proposition that the burgeoning numbers of LD may indicate a reluctance to use the classifications of mild mental retardation and emotional disturbance/behavior disorder, all groups obtained means near the middle of the scale indicating neutral overall sentiment. Again, however, it is important to recognize that all points on the continuum were used by substantial numbers of respondents indicating considerable differences of opinion on this matter. On items 9 and 10, the practitioner sample indicated disagreement with the assertion that the educational needs of the learning disabled and the mildly mentally retarded or the emotionally disturbed are very similar. On both items, the leadership obtained mean scores which we would classify as neutral, but both were in the direction of disagreement. The faculty means were between the means of the other two groups on both items. Responses to the latter two items suggest a slight preference against, rather than for, cross-categorical or noncategorical programming for the mildly handicapped.

The items which are perhaps most critical in terms of the recent NASP position statement advocating alternative delivery systems have to do with the relationship between regular education and the services now provided for the mildly handicapped within special education. These issues were addressed in items 5, 7, 11, and 14. Items 5 and 7, which suggested that better regular education instruction could prevent many students from being classified as LD and that the delivery system needed to be changed so that remedial services could be provided within regular education, elicited strong agreement from the NASP leadership and agreement from the practitioner and faculty samples. On these two items, as well as on a number of additional items, the NASP leadership is more strongly committed to changing the current system than is currently the case with practitioners and faculty. However, this difference should not be exaggerated. The sentiment for all groups on these issues was nearly always in the same direction.

The results for item 11 and item 14 are somewhat puzzling in that specific changes which would carry out what was suggested in item 7 were not endorsed strongly by either sample. In item 11, all groups obtained means indicating neutral sentiment concerning combining existing remedial and compensatory education programs with special education for the mildly handicapped. On item 14, the practitioner sample and NASP leadership obtained means within the neutral and disagree ranges, respectively, on the matter of whether clear distinctions should be maintained between regular education and slow learner, low achiever, and LD programs. There was considerable variation of sentiment for both samples on items 11 and 14. Perhaps the results on 11 and 14 indicate that, although most persons are strongly supportive of changing the present system (see items 5 and 7), there may be considerable disagreement on specific strategies to carry out these changes. In any event, these results do not provide strong support for merging currently established remedial/compensatory programs with special education for the mildly handicapped. If this is the case, that is, if there is strong sentiment for changes as long as the proposals are general (and not yet applicable) but opposition to specific reforms, the entire movement toward reform in these areas will face grave problems in the near future. The critical challenge will be to convince educators and others, not just of the need for global change, but of the need to support and carry out changes in specific components of the system. Perhaps the overall direction for the future is clear, but the specific battles are yet to be defined and resolved.

The effectiveness of special education services for learning disabled students was addressed with item 8. All group means were in the neutral range, with a slight trend toward disagreement on the part of the faculty and leadership. Again, the neutrality came about through sharply divided sentiment with some expressing the belief that the services were effective and others, in about equal numbers, indicating they thought the services were ineffective.

The role of school psychologists with the mildly handicapped and low achieving students in regular education was addressed with items 6 and 13, both of which elicited clear-cut sentiment from the groups. On item 6, all groups strongly agreed with the notion that school psychologists should be involved with prereferral interventions prior to consideration of LD classification. On item 13, all groups disagreed (the NASP leadership indicating strong disagreement) with the notion that school psychologists should concentrate on diagnosis rather than interventions. These results indicate quite clearly that school psychologists *do* see themselves being involved with regular education. The degree and nature of that involvement probably needs to be examined and developed further, particularly in light of the previously discussed information on the high proportion of time devoted to special education services.

A final item (12) asking whether overrepresentation of minority students in special education programs for the mildly handicapped is discriminatory elicited a nearly perfectly symmetrical distribution of responses from the practitioner and leadership groups, yielding means very close to the midpoint of 3. The faculty sample also produced a mean in the neutral range, but at a point (3.48) very close to disagreement with the assertion that overrepresentation constitutes discrimination. However, these mean scores do not accurately reflect the nature of the results on the overrepresentation issue. The results are much more along the lines of strong sentiment in both directions suggesting sharp division throughout school psychology concerning whether or not overrepresentation is discriminatory.

Quality of Training, Continuing Education Needs, and Program Improvement

A parallel array of items reflecting school psychology roles, professional competencies, and services for special populations was evaluated by practitioners and faculty. Both groups evaluated quality of training, but from a slightly different perspective; practitioners rated their graduate program while faculty rated quality in relation to their current program. On each item, practitioners rated continuing education need and faculty rated degree of need or desire to improve the training provided in their program. These ratings and various comparisons of practitioner and faculty priorities were analyzed. The results are provided in Tables 32, 33, and 34. All ratings were on the following continua:

	1	2	3	4	5
Quality	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor
Need/Desire for Continuing Education	Very High	High	Moderate	Moderately Low	Low
Need/Desire to Improve Program	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low

Table 32: Faculty and Practitioners' Ratings of Training Quality and Need/Desire to Improve
Section 1: Individual Psychoeducational Assessment

Item		Quality		Need/Desire To Improve		Differences			
								Quality	Need
		P	F	P	F	P_Q-P_N	F_Q-F_N	P_Q-F_Q	P_N-F_N
1) Educational Skills	$\bar{X}$	2.72	2.16	3.55	2.67	-0.83	-0.51	0.56	0.88
	sd	1.22	1.03	1.17	1.13				
2) Intelligence	$\bar{X}$	1.61	1.39	3.68	3.16	-2.07	-1.77	0.22	0.52
	sd	0.77	0.61	1.17	1.19				
3) Neuro-psychology	$\bar{X}$	3.90	3.17	2.24	1.15	1.66	2.02	0.73	1.09
	sd	1.18	2.78	0.99	1.15				
4) Adaptive Behavior	$\bar{X}$	3.32	2.40	2.93	3.01	0.39	-0.61	0.92	-0.08
	sd	1.16	0.90	1.17	1.04				
5) Projectives	$\bar{X}$	2.87	2.52	2.79	3.37	0.08	-0.85	0.35	-0.58
	sd	1.24	1.13	1.22	1.20				
6) Systematic Observation	$\bar{X}$	2.57	2.17	3.40	2.68	-0.83	-0.51	0.40	0.72
	sd	1.23	1.01	1.18	1.10				
7) Nondiscriminatory Methods	$\bar{X}$	3.17	2.17	3.28	2.82	-0.11	-0.65	1.00	0.46
	sd	1.22	0.87	1.10	1.05				

P = Practitioners; F = Faculty

In Table 32, the means, standard deviations, and mean differences over various combinations of ratings are presented for individual psychoeducational assessment. Several trends are apparent from the results in this table. First, there is considerable similarity in the practitioner and faculty ratings. Both ranked intelligence as the top area and neuropsychology as the bottom area on quality, and both indicated intelligence and neuropsychology as the bottom and top areas of continuing education need or program improvement. Similar results for the two groups were generally found for the other items on individual psychoeducational assessment.

The differences between variouls combinations of means are presented in the last four columns of Table 32. P_Q-P_N is seen as an estimate of the discrepancy between practitioners' views on quality of training and continuing education need. F_Q-F_N provides a similar estimate of faculty views on program quality and need to improve their program. P_Q-F_Q and P_N-Q_N provides rough contrasts of faculty and practitioner estimates of training program quality and need to improve.

Table 33: Faculty and Practitioner Ratings Continued
Section II: Consultation Methods and Intervention Techniques

Item		Quality		Need/Desire To Improve		Differences			
								Quality	Need
		P	F	P	F	P_Q-P_N	F_Q-F_N	P_Q-F_Q	P_N-F_N
1) Behavioral Consultation	X	2.59	2.02	2.98	2.80	-0.39	-0.78	0.57	0.18
	sd	1.18	0.93	1.22	1.24				
2) Mental Health Consultation	$\bar{X}$	2.93	2.23	3.02	2.84	-0.09	-0.61	0.70	0.18
	sd	1.15	0.95	1.08	1.17				
3) Organization Systems Consul	$\bar{X}$	3.36	2.80	3.20	2.86	0.16	-0.06	0.56	0.34
	sd	1.23	1.14	1.15	1.16				
4) Remedial Education	$\bar{X}$	3.08	2.66	3.15	2.79	-0.07	-0.13	0.42	0.36
	sd	1.18	0.95	1.14	1.10				
5) Behavior Management	$\bar{X}$	2.40	1.88	2.96	2.82	-0.56	-0.94	0.52	0.14
	sd	1.22	0.99	1.33	1.17				
6) Home-Based Interventions	$\bar{X}$	3.51	2.84	2.94	2.85	0.57	-0.01	0.67	0.09
	sd	1.18	1.04	1.18	1.10				
7) Community Referral Services	$\bar{X}$	3.18	2.30	3.23	3.06	-0.05	-0.76	0.88	0.17
	sd	1.14	0.99	1.18	0.99				
8) Counseling Methods/Skills	$\bar{X}$	2.69	2.22	2.44	2.69	0.25	-0.47	0.47	-0.25
	sd	1.19	1.08	1.19	1.26				
9) Evaluation of Intervention Outcomes	$\bar{X}$	3.20	2.52	2.83	2.69	0.37	-0.17	0.68	0.14
	sd	1.15	0.96	1.13	1.00				
10) Interventions Regular Educ. for Learning Problems	$\bar{X}$	3.08	2.33	2.51	2.60	0.57	-0.27	0.75	-0.09
	sd	1.13	0.88	1.14	1.14				
11) Interventions in Regular Education for Beh/Emotional Problems	$\bar{X}$	2.95	2.19	2.29	2.48	0.66	-0.29	0.76	-0.19
	sd	1.14	0.81	1.17	1.14				

P = Practitioners; F = Faculty

These differences provide further support for the high degree of similarity in ratings by the two groups, with some interesting trends. First, practitioners evaluated training quality lower than faculty on every item. Second, the faculty indicated only one area, neuropsychology, where current quality was lower than need/desire to improve. In all other areas, faculty rated current quality higher than need/desire to improve their program.

Faculty and practitioner ratings of consultation methods and intervention techniques are presented in Table 33. Again, there was considerable agreement in the ratings of quality and need to improve; behavior management received the top rating in quality and home-based interventions the lowest for both groups. Ratings for need to improve were again very similar. The last item in the table, interventions in regular education for students with behavioral/emotional problems, received the highest rating from both groups on need to improve while community referral services received the lowest

Table 34: Faculty Practitioner Ratings Continued
Section III: Assessment and Interventions with Special Populations

Item		Quality P	Quality F	Need/Desire To Improve P	Need/Desire To Improve F	Differences P_Q-P_N	Differences F_Q-F_N	Differences Quality P_Q-F_Q	Differences Need P_N-F_N
1) Learning Disabled	$\bar{X}$	2.37	1.76	2.97	2.89	-0.60	-1.13	0.61	-0.08
	sd	1.14	0.72	1.23	1.19				
2) Mildly Disabled	$\bar{X}$	2.30	2.00	3.42	3.02	-1.12	-1.02	0.30	0.40
	sd	1.08	0.98	1.16	1.12				
3) Emotionally Disturbed	$\bar{X}$	2.81	2.04	2.33	2.64	0.48	-0.60	0.77	-0.31
	sd	1.13	0.78	1.17	1.06				
4) Gifted	$\bar{X}$	3.35	2.66	3.37	2.91	-0.02	-0.25	0.69	0.46
	sd	1.29	1.07	1.26	1.07				
5) Low Incidence (Sensory, Severely, Handicapped, etc.)	$\bar{X}$	3.49	3.07	2.85	2.73	0.64	0.34	0.42	0.12
	sd	1.23	1.14	1.16	1.12				
6) Bilingual Students	$\bar{X}$	4.48	3.57	3.31	3.14	1.17	0.43	0.91	0.17
	sd	0.93	1.20	1.17	1.08				
7) Minority Students	X	3.67	2.66	3.16	2.86	0.16	-0.20	1.01	0.30
	sd	1.16	1.14	1.04	1.14				

P = Practitioners; F = Faculty

rating from both groups. Trends identified in the differences comparisons in the previous section were also apparent in this section. Again, practitioners always rated training quality lower than faculty; and faculty always rated current training quality higher than need to improve.

The faculty and practitioner ratings of training quality and need to improve over seven items dealing with assessment and interventions with special populations are presented in Table 34. Mild mental retardation and learning disabilities received the highest quality ratings from both groups and bilingual students was the lowest area for both groups. Emotionally disturbed received the highest rating for need to improve for both groups, but different areas received the lowest means for need to improve, gifted for practitioners and bilingual students for faculty.

The top and bottom areas in quality across the three sections are summarized in Table 35. Again, the very high degree of similarity among faculty and practitioner ratings, conducted independently using slightly different points of reference, was quite impressive. For both top and bottom ratings, four of the five areas were the same for both groups.

Table 35: Top and Bottom Areas in Quality of Training

Top Areas		Bottom Areas	
Practitioner	Faculty	Practitioner	Faculty
1) Intelligence	1) Intelligence	1) Bilingual Students	1) Bilingual Students
2) Mild Mental Retardation	2) Learning Disabled	2) Neuro-psychology	2) Neuro-psychology
3) Learning Disability	3) Behavior Management	**3) Minority Students	3) Low Incidence
4) Behavior Management	4) Mild Mental Retardation	4) Low Incidence	4) Home-Based Interventions
*5) Systematic Observation	*5) Behavior Consultation	5) Home-Based Interventions	**5) Organizational/Systems Consultation

---

*Not on both lists of top 5 areas. **Not on both lists of bottom scores.

The top and bottom areas for continuing education need/desire and program improvement are presented in Table 36. Again, there was impressive similarity in the practitioner and faculty ratings, particularly in the areas most in need of improvement where 4 of the 5 were the same. Some 8 differences emerged in bottom priorities for need to improve, where only 2 of the 5 areas were the same for practitioners and faculty.

Table 36: Top and Bottom Areas on Need to Improve

Top Areas		Bottom Areas	
Practitioner	Faculty	Practitioner	Faculty
1) Neuropsychology	1) Neuropsychology	1) Intelligence	1) Projectives
2) Interventions in regular education for behavioral/emotional problems	2) Interventions in regular education for behavioral/emotional problems	2) Educational Skills	2) Intelligence
3) Emotionally Disturbed	3) Interventions in regular education for learning problems	3) Mild Mental Retardation	3) Bilingual Students
*4) Counseling Skills	4) Emotionally Disturbed	4) Systematic Observation	4) Community Referral
5) Interventions in regular education for learning problems	*5) Several were at 2.67 to 2.69	5) Gifted	5) Mild Mental Retardation

---

*Different areas in top 5 for Practitioners and Faculty.

Two additional sets of comparisons were analyzed. First, the ratings of Quality and Need where need was greater than quality were analyzed for faculty and practitioners. These comparisons provide an approximate index of the size of the differences between perceptions of quality and need. The largest discrepancies might be seen as indicating the areas where practitioners and faculty see the greatest need to improve. These discrepancies are summmarized in Table 37.

In Table 37, there is, again, a high degree of similarity in practitioner and faculty ratings. Three of the areas were the same, which was the maximum possible because there were only three areas rated by faculty as higher in need to improve than current quality. The additional areas on the practitioner priorities involved interventions of various kinds.

Table 37: Largest Discrepancies Between Need and Quality Where Need is Higher than Quality

Practitioner	Faculty
1) Neuropsychology	1) Neuropsychology
2) Bilingual Students	2) Bilingual Students
3) Interventions in Regular Education for Behavior/ Emotional Problems	3) Low Incidence
4) Low Incidence	*4)
5) Tie: Interventions in Regular Education for Learning Problems and Home-Based Interventions	*5)

---

*There were only 3 areas rated by faculty as higher in need than current quality.

The various results concerning faculty and practitioner ratings of training quality and need to improve were quite consistent for the two groups across various analyses. Neuropsychology was a top priority for both groups. The usefulness of neuropsychological information has been questioned and sharply disputed (Reschly & Gresham, in press), but the preferences of faculty and practitioners are quite clear. Both groups desire more emphasis on neuropsychology. The other priorities are generally in areas related to interventions, particularly regular education interventions for students with learning and/or behavioral problems. These priorities, in contrast to neuropsychology, seem to be closely related to the NASP commitment to development of alternative services within regular education for students now classified as mildly handicapped and served in special education.

Assessment Procedures Survey

A listing of assessment procedures/instruments organized into nine sections was included on the practitioner (Blue Form) and faculty surveys. Practitioners were asked to estimate the number of times per month they used

---

Table 38: Assessment Procedures Survey: Frequency of Use of Adaptive Behavior Measures

[1] Instrument	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	Frequency per Month				[2] Supervised Practice in Program
			0	1-5	6-10	11	
Vineland Revised	1.72	2.92	47.9%	43.4%	7.5%	1.0%	61.0%
SIB	0.27	1.54	91.7%	7.4%	0.4%	0.4%	16.0%
CTAB	0.06	0.46	97.9%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.0%
AAMD-PS	0.63	1.49	71.7%	26.3%	2.1%	0.0%	38.0%
CABS	0.28	1.27	90.0%	9.6%	0.0%	0.4%	25.0%
ABIC	0.15	0.67	93.3%	6.6%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
AAMD-Clinical	0.12	0.78	95.8%	3.8%	0.4%	0.0%	6.0%
Other	0.93	3.54	84.6%	10.0%	4.2%	1.2%	25.0%

---

[1] Key: Vineland Revised = Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales
SIB = Scales of Independent Behavior
CTAB = Comprehensive Test of Adaptive Behavior
AAMD-PS = American Association on Mental Deficiency - Public School or School Edition
CABS = Children's Adaptive Behavior Scale
ABIC = Adaptive Behavior Inventory for Children
AAMD-Clinical = American Association on Mental Deficiency - Clinical Edition

[2] In the last column, the percent of programs providing _supervised practice_ in use of the instrument is presented. Supervised practice was defined, "The student will actually administer, write-up, and interpret at least one test/procedure. The 61% for the Vineland Revised means that 61% of the faculty responding indicated supervised practice in use of the Vineland Revised was provided in their program.

each instrument/procedure. Faculty members were asked to check whether students received supervised practice, demonstration and review, or no exposure for each instrument/procedure. Supervised practice was defined as, "The student will actually administer, write up, and interpret at least one test." Demonstrated and reviewed was defined as, "The test/procedure is described and demonstrated." Not covered was defined as, "The test/procedure may be mentioned in a text or lecture, but is not demonstrated or used."

The results for the practitioner and faculty samples are presented in Tables 38-47. Means, standard deviations, and the percent of respondents indicating the frequency with which they used various instruments are provided for the practitioner sample. In the far right column of each table the percent of faculty respondents indicating supervised practice for each instrument/procedure is reported.

Table 39: Assessment Procedures Survey: Ability/Intelligence

[1] Instrument	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	Frequency per Month 0	 1-5	 6-10	 11	[2] Supervised Practice in Program
K-ABC	1.33	3.65	62.1%	32.6%	2.9%	2.5%	52.0%
Wechsler	9.92	7.16	4.1%	23.3%	41.6%	30.9%	97.0%
Stanford-Binet	1.57	2.31	40.0%	55.8%	2.3%	0.8%	92.0%
Bayley	0.26	1.02	87.9%	11.3%	0.8%	0.0%	24.0%
McCarthy	0.59	2.31	76.7%	22.2%	0.4%	0.0%	46.0%
PPVT-R	2.42	5.01	60.6%	26.5%	6.2%	6.6%	63.0%
W-J Ability	0.85	2.86	80.9%	13.7%	4.1%	1.2%	57.0%
Other	0.75	3.19	83.8%	12.8%	1.6%	1.6%	59.0%

---

[1] Key: K-ABC = Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children
PPVT-R = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test - Revised
McCarthy = McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities
Wechsler = Any of the Wechsler Scales
W-J Ability = Woodcock-Johnson Cognitive

[2] In the last column, the percent of programs providing supervised practice in use of the instrument is presented. Supervised practice was defined, "The student, will actually administer, write-up, and interpret at least one test/procedure.

Adaptive Behavior. The results in Table 38 indicate that adaptive behavior is not assessed very often by school psychologists. The most frequently used instrument is the Vineland-Revised, which could be the Survey, Classroom, or Expanded Forms. This instrument was not used very often, perhaps twice per month by the typical practitioner. The second instrument in frequency of use was the School Form of the AAMD Adaptive Behavior Scales, but it was not used very often ($X = 0.63$). Other adaptive behavior measures, including two technically sound instruments published in 1984, the CTAB and the SIB, are used rarely (recall that these data were collected in the 1985-86 school year). The faculty responses concerning supervised practice with each instrument were very similar to practitioner use, a pattern that will become very familiar as the results in this section are reviewed.

Ability/Intelligence. The dominance of the Wechsler Scales in the ability/intelligence section of the assessment procedures survey is apparent in Table 39. The mean frequency per month for the Wechsler Scales was more than four times the mean of the next instrument (the PPVT-R) and over six times the mean frequency of the Stanford-Binet. The PPVT-R, usually seen as a brief screening measure, is typically used with another instrument such as a Wechsler, Binet, or K-ABC. Thus, the dominance of the Wechsler is even more

Table 40: Assessment Procedures Survey: Achievement Screening

[1] Instrument	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	Frequency per Month 0	1-5	6-10	11	[2] Supervised Practice In Program
WRAT-R	5.14	7.25	41.9%	26.1%	15.7%	16.1%	79.0%
PIAT	1.49	3.89	71.4%	20.4%	6.6%	1.6%	66.0%
W-J Ach	4.34	6.47	51.5%	19.5%	15.3%	13.5%	67.0%
Woodcock Rdg	1.16	2.90	72.2%	22.4%	3.7%	1.6%	46.0%
Other	1.17	3.77	84.2%	7.9%	4.1%	3.7%	54.0%

---

[1] Key: WRAT-R = Wide Range Achievement Test - Revised
PIAT = Peabody Individual Achievement Test
W-J Ach = Woodcock-Johnson Achievement
Woodcock Rdg = Woodcock Reading

[2] In the last column, the percent of programs providing supervised practice in use of the instrument is presented. Supervised practice was defined, "The student will actually administer, write-up, and interpret at least one test/procedure.

pronounced than the actual rank order of the instruments indicates. Again, the supervised practice percentages were very similar to the frequency of use, with the Stanford-Binet as a low exception. This venerable denizen of the school psychology profession is far more prominent in graduate training than actual practice. However, the position in both realms may change with the new Binet which was, at the time of this survey, just entering the market.

Achievement Tests. Statistics reflecting frequency of use and supervised practice for screening and diagnostic achievement tests are provided in Tables 40 and 41. Again, there is rather close correspondence between what is taught in training programs and what is used by practitioners. The most frequently used achievement measure is the WRAT-R, a troubling result in view of the very negative reviews of this instrument's technical adequacy (Salvia & Ysseldyke, 1985; Witt, 1986). The Woodcock-Johnson, PIAT, and Key-Math, generally regarded as technically adequate at least for screening, were used fairly frequently and are usually taught in programs.

Table 41: Assessment Procedures Survey: Achievement Diagnostic

[1]Instrument	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	Frequency per Month 0	1-5	6-10	11	[2]Supervised Practice in Program
Durrell	0.40	2.34	94.2%	3.3%	1.2%	1.2%	20.0%
Gates-McG	0.11	0.57	96.3%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%	15.0%
Gray Oral	0.27	1.43	93.4%	5.3%	0.8%	0.4%	29.0%
Brigance	0.44	1.40	83.0%	15.4%	1.2%	0.4%	33.0%
Key Math	1.12	2.75	67.6%	27.3%	3.3%	1.6%	59.0%
IRI	1.35	4.47	80.5%	13.3%	2.1%	4.0%	32.0%
Other	1.55	5.95	87.1%	4.6%	4.1%	4.0%	42.0%

---

[1] Key: Gates-McG = Gates-McGinite
IRI = Informal Reading Inventory

[2] In the last column, the percent of programs providing supervised practice in use of the instrument is presented. Supervised practice was defined, "The student will actually administer, write-up, and interpret at least one test/procedure.

Projectives/Figure Drawings. The practitioner and faculty samples provided information on use and training concerning various projective devices. The results in Table 42 unequivocally indicate the continuing popularity of several procedures often criticized as technically flawed. The Draw-A-Person, House-Tree-Person, and Kinetic Family Drawings are all used fairly frequently, generally more frequently than achievement measures. These practitioner use patterns match the supervised practice results almost perfectly, suggesting again the close correspondence between graduate program training and actual practice. These results also indicate that use of these questionable instruments/procedures is likely to continue far into the future, since current students are, by and large, receiving supervised practice in these areas.

Table 42: Assessment Procedures Survey: Projectives/Figure Drawings

[1]Instrument	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	Frequency per Month 0	1-5	6-10	11	[2]Supervised Practice in Program
Rorschach	0.93	2.98	80.1%	15.4%	2.0%	2.4%	42.0%
Draw A Person	7.80	8.06	22.0%	27.8%	25.2%	24.8%	75.0%
House Tree Person	4.01	6.43	47.7%	24.1%	18.2%	9.9%	60.0%
KFD	3.50	5.26	43.6%	34.4%	14.0%	7.8%	57.0%
TAT	1.93	4.56	61.4%	29.9%	4.5%	4.0%	64.0%
Other	2.48	5.43	64.3%	19.8%	10.0%	5.8%	47.0%

---

[1] Key: KFD = Kinetic Family Drawing
TAT = Thematic Apperception Test

[2] In the last column, the percent of programs providing *supervised practice* in use of the instrument is presented. Supervised practice was defined, "The student will actually administer, write-up, and interpret at least one test/procedure.

Perceptual-Motor Instruments. The list of perceptual motor instruments was not as thorough as it should have been due to an oversight on our part. The list in the faculty survey included several instruments that did not appear on the practitioner from (see Appendices B and D). Although two or three instruments that do not appear in Table 43 were probably used to a moderate degree, the major finding was not affected. Specifically, the Bender is the most widely used and most frequently taught instrument in this area. The Bender also is criticized because of limitations in technical adequacy (Salvia & Ysseldyke, 1985). Nevertheless, it is nearly always taught in training programs and is frequently used.

Table 43: Assessment Procedures Survey: Perceptual/Motor

[1] Instrument	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	Frequency per Month 0	1-5	6-10	11	[2] Supervised Practice In Program
Bender	8.99	7.25	14.2%	23.8%	29.7%	32.3%	87.0%
Benton VRT	0.28	1.28	91.6%	6.8%	1.7%	0.0%	16.0%
Frostig	0.09	0.52	94.5%	5.0%	0.4%	0.0%	8.0%
VAKT	0.13	0.67	95.4%	4.2%	0.4%	0.0%	10.0%
Other	3.12	5.05	56.9%	22.5%	12.5%	7.9%	44.0%

---

[1] Key: Benton VRT = Benton Visual Retention Test
VAKT = Visual, Auditory, Kinesthetic, Tactile

[2] In the last column, the percent of programs providing supervised practice in use of the instrument is presented. Supervised practice was defined, "The student will actually administer, write-up, and interpret at least one test/procedure.

Informal Measures. Results concerning four kinds of informal measures are presented in Table 44. Here there was some difference in practitioner use and graduate program supervised practice. Practitioners indicated greater use of unstructured interview and anecdotal classroom observation while faculty reported somewhat greater emphasis on structured interview and behavioral observation. These differences were not large and both groups indicated unstructured interview was the most prominent informal procedure.

Table 44: Assessment Procedures Survey: Informal Measures

Instrument/Procedure	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	Frequency per Month 0	1-5	6-10	11	[1] Supervised Practice In Program
Structured Interview (Prob. Ident. Interview)	2.44	4.98	65.1%	21.5%	6.6%	6.7%	69.0%
Unstructured Interview	9.57	10.45	14.3%	25.6%	30.7%	29.4%	77.0%
Structured Classroom Observation (Behavioral)	4.97	6.06	33.2%	34.3%	20.1%	12.2%	75.0%
Unstructured (Anecdotal) Classroom Observation	6.99	8.93	18.9%	42.8%	21.4%	16.8%	62.0%
Other	0.59	2.90	92.4%	3.2%	3.4%	0.8%	44.0%

---

[1] In the last column, the percent of programs providing supervised practice in use of the instrument is presented. Supervised practice was defined, "The student will actually administer, write-up, and interpret at least one test/procedure.

Checklists and Rating Scales. A list of checklists and rating scales was provided on one of the practitioner forms and the faculty survey. The procedures listed by name were not used very frequently, and not taught in the majority of programs. The most frequently used categories in both samples were "other-teacher" and "other-parent." It appears that locally developed, non-commercial assessment devices are used fairly frequently by practitioners and included in about two-thirds of the graduate programs. Formal, published instuments such as those listed in Table 45 are not used very often. The technical adequacy of several of these instruments, e.g., the SBA, Walker, and Achenbach-Edelbrock, is fairly good. These devices certainly fare better than the WRAT and Bender in most reviews of technical adequacy, and have the added advantage of being much more closely related to classroom interventions, an area where continuing education and program improvement are needed according to results presented in the previous section.

Table 45: Assessment Procedures Survey: Checklists/Rating Scales

[1] Instrument/Procedure	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	Frequency per Month 0	1-5	6-10	11	[2] Supervised Practice In Program
MMPI	0.24	1.19	91.2%	7.5%	0.8%	0.4%	36.0%
SBA	0.33	2.27	94.1%	4.5%	0.4%	0.8%	11.0%
Walker	0.55	1.81	84.0%	10.4%	2.5%	0.4%	23.0%
Achenbach/Edelbrock	0.52	2.02	89.6%	7.6%	1.2%	1.7%	21.0%
Other - Completed by Teacher	3.47	5.51	47.5%	32.5%	11.7%	8.3%	62.0%
Other - Completed by Parent	2.06	5.04	63.8%	24.6%	7.1%	4.4%	63.0%

---

[1] Key: MMPI = Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory
SBA = Social Behavioral Assessment
Walker = Walker Problem Behavior Checklist

[2] In the last column, the percent of programs providing supervised practice in use of the instrument is presented. Supervised practice was defined, "The student will actually administer, write-up, and interpret at least one test/procedure.

Batteries and Miscellaneous. Results for a list of various batteries, e.g., SOMPA and M-MAC, and miscellaneous instruments/procedures are reported in Table 46. There is little to discuss here, other than the near total absence of use or graduate training in these areas. These results indicate that two large scale, comprehensive batteries, the M-MAC and SOMPA, are largely ignored by practitioners and by graduate program faculty.

Table 46: Assessment Procedures Survey: Batteries and Miscellaneous

[1] Instrument/Procedure	$\overline{X}$	s.d.	Frequency per Month				[2] Supervised Practice In Program
			0	1-5	6-10	11	
SOMPA-Sociocultural	0.25	2.02	95.4%	3.8%	0.0%	0.8%	13.0%
SOMPA-Health	0.19	1.68	95.8%	3.7%	0.0%	0.4%	11.0%
SOMPA-PD	0.13	1.63	97.9%	1.7%	0.0%	0.4%	9.0%
SOMPA-ELP	0.11	1.19	96.6%	2.9%	0.0%	0.4%	9.0%
M-MAC	0.00	0.00	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%
Developmental Checklist	0.20	0.98	93.2%	6.4%	0.4%	0.0%	16.0%
LPAD (or Variation)	0.06	0.00	99.2%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	6.0%
Boehm	0.27	1.07	88.6%	10.4%	0.8%	0.0%	17.0%
Bracken	0.24	1.48	94.6%	4.1%	0.0%	1.2%	7.0%

---

[1] Key: SOMPA = System of Multicultural Pluralistic Assessment
PD = Physical Dexterity
ELP = Estimated Learning Potential
M-MAC = McDermott
LPAD = Learning Potential Assessment Device
Boehm = Boehm Test of Basic Concepts
Bracken = Bracken Basic Concept Scale

[2] In the last column, the percent of programs providing supervised practice in use of the instrument is presented. Supervised practice was defined, "The student will actually administer, write-up, and interpret at least one test/procedure.

Summary. A summary of the results of the assessment procedures survey is provided in Table 47. The most frequently used measures in the practice of school psychology are the Wechsler Scales, unstructured interview, the Bender, the Draw-A-Person, Unstructured Classroom Observation, and the WRAT. None of these is closely related to interventions for learning or behavioral problems, in regular or special education. All are more likely to be used in eligibility determination in preplacement or re-evaluations of students. The results from the survey of faculty were virtually identical. The only exception in the top six instruments was the Stanford-Binet, which was the second ranking instrument in the faculty survey, but did not appear in the top 10 on the practitioner survey.

Table 47: Faculty and Practitioner Ratings: of Instruments/Procedures

Rank Order of Instrument in Practitioner Sample	Practitioner Estimates Times per Month	[1]Faculty Responses: Percent Providing Supervised Practice
1. Wechsler Scales	9.92	97% (1)
2. Unstructured Interview	9.57	77% (5)
3. Bender	8.99	87% (3)
4. Draw A Person	7.80	75% (6 tie)
5. Unstructured Classroom Observation	6.99	62% (not in top 10)
6. WRAT-R	5.14	79% (4)
7. Structured Classroom Observation (Behavioral)	4.97	75% (6 tie)
8. Woodcock-Johnson Achievement	4.34	67% (9)
9. House-Tree-Person	4.01	60% (not in top 10)
10. Kinetic Family Drawing	3.50	57% (not in top 10)

---

[1] The rank order position of each instrument in the Faculty sample results is indicated by the number in parentheses. Seven of the top 10 instruments were the same for both samples. The differences were: Rank order 2 in the faculty results was the Stanford Binet (92%); 8 was structured interview (69%); and 10 was the Peabody Individual Achievement Test (66%). Otherwise, the same instruments appeared in the top 10 for both groups.

These results suggest much work is needed for the development and implementation of psychological services consistent with the alternative delivery system(s) supported by NASP (Reschly, 1987). One of the major changes in the alternative delivery systems is likely to be greater emphasis on the development and delivery of services within regular education. Current assessment practices emphasizing classification of students as handicapped, i.e., eligibility determination, would quite likely be reduced, if not virtually eliminated, in the alternative models. And the need for the kind of assessment that predominates now in training and practice will be sharply reduced. The venerable instruments that are taught most frequently and used most often, the Wechsler Scales, the Bender, and the WRAT, have little, if any, relevance to regular education interventions because they yield almost no useful information on _what_ or _how_ to teach or intervene. The Wechsler Scales are useful in estimating the degree, and likely resistance to remediation, of achievement problems, or the likelihood of the need for long-term services and an alternate curriculum. However, the numbers of students who are currently placed _out_ of the regular curriculum usually into special classes, is a relatively small percent of the mildly handicapped, about 20%, mostly classified as mildly mentally retarded. The vast majority of the mildly handicapped are classified as learning disabled and are in part-time special education programs which maintain them in the regular curriculum. It is LD students with whom we spend most of our time (see Table 29) and about whom we express doubts concerning whether they are really handicapped (see Table 31).

The kind of assessment required in alternative delivery systems is reasonably well known. Far greater emphasis will be placed on assessment within natural settings, particularly, precise determination of academic skills, careful measurement of social skills and task related behaviors, and detailed examination of, as well as systematic changes in, instruction. The traditional instruments described above are largely irrelevant in this kind of assessment. Behavioral assessment and curriculum based measurement are intimately related to the kind of assessment required in the alternative delivery systems endorsed by NASP (Grimes & Reschly, 1986; Reschly & Casey, 1986). These skills clearly need to be higher priorities in graduate programs and continuing education in order for school psychologists to prepare for a different future that we seek, but may not, as a profession, be ready to serve. Clearly, much work remains to be done in reforming _both_ graduate programs and the practice of school psychology.

References

Grimes, J. P., & Reschly, D. J. (1986). Relevant educational assessment and intervention model (RE-AIM). (Project proposal funded by the United States Department of Education.) Des Moines, IA: Iowa Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education.

Reschly, D. J. (1987). Special education reform: School psychology revolution. Manuscript submitted for publication. Ames, IA: Iowa State University, Department of Psychology.

Reschly, D. J., & Casey, A. (1986). Behavioral consultation. Ames, IA: Iowa State University, Department of Psychology, Project RE-AIM.

Reschly, D. J., & Gresham, F. M. (In press). Current neuropsychological diagnosis of learning problems: A leap of faith. In C. R. Reynolds (Ed.), Child neuropsychology techniques of diagnosis and treatment. New York: Plenum.

Salvia, J., & Ysseldyke, J. (1985). Assessment in special and remedial education (3rd ed.). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Witt, J. C. (1986). Review of the Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised. Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 4, 87-90.

NATIONAL SURVEY OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

November, 1985

Practitioner Sample

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

1) Sex (check): Male_____ Female_____

2) Age (check): under 25_____ 25-34_____ 35-44 _____
45-54 _____ 55-64_____ over 64_____

3) Years of experience as a school psychologist?__________

4) Do you have a certificate as a teacher? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, in what area(s)?
elementary_____ secondary_____ special education_____

5) Have you taught on a full-time basis? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, please specify level and years of experience.

6) What is your level of graduate education in school psychology?
_____Masters Degree (about 30 semester hours)
_____Masters Degree (about 45 semester hours)
_____Specialist Degree (about 60 semester hours)
_____Doctoral Degree

7) At what institutions have you done graduate work in school psychology?

	Institution Name	Location	Major
a)	____________________	__________________	_________________________
	Degree__________	Year__________	
b)	____________________	__________________	_________________________
	Degree__________	Year__________	

8) What is the primary setting of your employment? (check)
a) public schools_____ b) college or university_____
b) private practice_____ d) institutional/residential_____
e) other (specify)___________________

9) What is the nature of the community of your primary employment setting? (check)
a) largely urban_____ b) largely rural_____
c) largely suburban_____ d) combination of _______________________ (specify)

10) What is the ratio of school psychologists to students in your setting
(for example, one psychologist per 2,000 students)?__________________

11) What per cent of the students in your setting are minority?_____
What per cent of these students are: black_____; Hispanic_____;
Oriental_____; Native Indian_____.

12) Do you spend more than 25% of your time on a special assignment with a specific type of handicapped student (e.g., hearing impaired, severely retarded, etc.)? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, please describe.

13) What is your annual salary paid by your primary employer? (check)
a) below $10,000 _____
b) $10,000-$12,999_____
c) $13,000-$15,999_____
d) $16,000-$18,999_____
e) $19,000-$21,999_____
f) $22,000-$24,999_____
g) $25,000-$29,999_____
h) $30,000-$34,999_____
i) $35,000-$39,999_____
j) $40,000-$44,999_____
k) $45,000-$49,999_____
l) $50,000 & over _____

14) Are you engaged in outside/secondary employment? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, please check the type of employment below:
a) private practice_____
b) teach at college/university_____
c) consult with schools_____
d) consult with agencies_____
e) other (specify)____
If no, do you plan to engage in outside employment in the future? If so, please specify.

15) What is the approximate amount of annual income from outside/secondary employment?
_____below $ 1,000 _____$1,000-$5,000 _____$5,000-$10,000
_____over $10,000 _____I prefer to NOT disclose this information.

16) Is your income as a school psychologist (check one):
_____ a. the principal source of income in your household
_____ b. about equal to another source of income in your household (e.g., spouse's income)
_____ c. secondary to another source of income in your household

II. MEMBER INVOLVEMENT IN PUBLIC RELATIONS AND POLICY ADVOCACY:

1) To what extent are you involved with the activities of NASP or state and local school psychology groups on legislation, standards, public relations, and child advocacy?

1 2 3 4 5
/___________/___________/___________/___________/
Very Much Some Very Little

2) Would you be willing to contact your Senators or members of Congress?
_____Yes _____No _____Not Sure

3) Would you be willing to inform other groups about school psychology by speaking at their meetings? _____Yes _____No _____Not Certain

4) How much time per week would you be willing to devote to school psychology public relations and policy advocacy work?
_____None _____Up to 1 hour _____1-2 hours _____Over 2 hours

NASP Survey - Practitioner Sample

II. NASP SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES: PRIORITIES AND IMPORTANCE.

In your opinion, how important are the following NASP services and activities? Please circle the number which corresponds to your rating where:

1	2	3	4	5	No Opinion
Crucial Top Priority First		Moderate Importance		Low Priority Less Important	☐

	Top		Moderate		Low	No Opinion
1) Development and implementation of standards for graduate programs.	1	2	3	4	5	☐
2) Public information and public relations activities.	1	2	3	4	5	☐
3) Liaison with other professional and advocacy groups.	1	2	3	4	5	☐
4) Assistance to State Associations of School Psychologists.	1	2	3	4	5	☐
5) Publications (*Review* and *Communique*).	1	2	3	4	5	☐
6) Publications and monographs (e.g., *Best Practices in School Psychology*)	1	2	3	4	5	☐
7) Professional development training packages in various formats (written, videotape, computer disk, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5	☐
8) Influencing state legislation, rules, regulations, and policy.	1	2	3	4	5	☐
9) Development and promotion of quality standards for school psychological services in schools (ratios, support, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5	☐
10) Development and promotion of rights and opportunities in regard to licensure for private practice.	1	2	3	4	5	☐
11) Influencing Federal legislation, rules, regulations, and policy.	1	2	3	4	5	☐
12) Convention program and workshops.	1	2	3	4	5	☐
13) Providing opportunities to purchase professional liability insurance covering public and private practice.	1	2	3	4	5	☐

Top Moderate Low
/___/___/___/___/___/ /__/
1 2 3 4 5

14) Providing opportunities for more involvement with international school psychology, e.g., sponsoring study tours.

/___/___/___/___/___/ /__/
1 2 3 4 5

15) Promoting change in current delivery system such as non-categorical funding, increased development and use of regular education remedial options for the mildly handicapped, etc.

16) Comments on Priorities.

III. COMPUTER USE:

1) Do you have easy access to a micro-computer in your work setting?
_____Yes _____No

If yes, what is the brand name of the computer?
_____Apple or Apple Compatible
_____IBM or IBM Compatible
_____TRS 80
_____Commodore
_____Other (Please specify)
____

2) Do you have access to a computer at home?
_____Yes _____No

If yes, what is the brand?
_____Apple or Apple Compatible
_____IBM or IBM Compatible
_____TRS 80
_____Commodore
_____Other (Please specify)
____

3) Do you have a modem?
_____Yes (home)
_____Yes (work)
_____Yes (Both)
_____No

4) Do you have access to Special Net? _____Yes _____No

5) How do you use the computer now? (Please check all that apply.)
_____Word processing
_____Test analysis
_____Report writing
_____Graphing
_____Counseling
_____Data base
_____Other. Please specify
_____Spread sheet
_____Research
_____Statistics
_____Software review
_____Academic remediation
_____Management

NASP Survey - Practitioner Sample

IV. NASP EXECUTIVE/OFFICE STRUCTURE:

Alternatives to the current part-time executive manager - decentralized office structure will be considered by the NASP Delegate Assembly in the near future. Members' views on these matters are very important. Please respond to the following items using the rating scale provided, or, when appropriate, indicate no opinion or lack of knowledge.

1) Do you find the current executive manager - office structure confusing?
Yes____ No____ No Opinion____

2) How would you rate your communications with the NASP management where:

1	2	3	4	5	No Opinion
Very Prompt & Efficient Very Reponsive to my Requests		Moderate or Average		Slow & Inefficient Not Very Responsive	☐

3) Are the procedures for gaining access to various NASP services clear to you? Yes____ No____ No Opinion____

4) How effective is the current office - manager structure?

1	2	3	4	5	No Opinion
Very Effective		Average		Ineffective	☐

5) A central office would improve services to members and enhance accomplishment of NASP priorities.

1	2	3	4	5	No Opinion
Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree	☐

6) Full-time staff would improve services to members and enhance accomplishment of NASP priorities.

1	2	3	4	5	No Opinion
Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree	☐

7) Comments:

NASP Survey - Practitioner Sample

V. SPRING DELEGATE ASSEMBLY - EXECUTIVE BOARD (DA-EB) REIMBURSEMENT:

As you may know, NASP Delegates, Directors, and Officers are reimbursed for expenses incurred for participating in the Fall Delegate Assembly - Executive Board (DA-EB) meeting. Members of the EB (Regional Directors and Officers) are reimbursed for expenses incurred for the July and January EB meetings. Expenses incurred for participating in the Spring DA-EB are not reimbursed. That meeting is scheduled during, just before, or immediately after the NASP Annual Convention.

A proposal to begin reimbursement of Delegates, Directors, and Officers for attending the Spring DA-EB will be considered by the DA-EB in April, 1986 in meetings held immediately after the 1986 Convention. Although there are many pro and con considerations, the major arguments are: (1) Requiring delegates, directors, and officers to assume full responsibility for the spring EB-DA expenses creates a hardship for some persons and may discourage participation by some members; vs (2) Reimbursement would consume funds which are needed to support other objectives of the association, and attending the national convention is a responsibility of NASP members.

Your opinions on this issue are very important to the DA-EB deliberations.

1) Have you participated in NASP leadership? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, indicate: _____Delegate _____Director _____Officer
_____Committee Chair

2) Would (or has) the absence of reimbursement for the Spring DA-EB held at the convention influence your decision to be active in the NASP leadership? _____Yes _____Makes little difference _____No

3) Would (or does) your employer or your state association reimburse your expenses for attending the DA-EB at the NASP convention?
_____Yes (full or partial) _____No _____Uncertain or I don't know
If Yes or Uncertain on Item 3, then answer Items 4 & 5. If No to Item 3, go to Item 6.

4) How much reimbursement is (or would be) provided?
_____Full _____Partial
If Partial, what amount or percent of costs would be paid?__________

5) Would your employer or your state association continue to reimburse your expenses IF reimbursement from NASP were available?
_____Yes _____No _____Don't know

6) Do you think NASP should reimburse the expenses of Delegates, Directors, and Officers at the Spring DA-EB?
_____Yes _____No _____No Opinion
If you answered Yes to Item 6, please indicate the level of reimbursement that seems most appropriate to you.

Level of Reimbursement	Estimated Cost
_____Meals only for the 2-3 days that the DA-EB meets	$ 3-$ 5,000
_____Lodging only (for the 2-3 days that the DA-EB meets)	$ 3-$ 5,000
_____Meals and lodging	$ 6-$10,000
_____Travel only	$25-$40,000
_____Full reimbursement	$30-$50,000

NASP Survey - Practitioner Sample

VI. SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY CREDENTIALING (Note. In this section, license refers to legal authority to engage in private practice, and certification refers to legal authority to practice in the public schools):

1. Are you certified to provide services in schools as a school psychologist?
   Yes_____ No_____

2. Are you licensed for private practice? Yes_____ No_____
   If yes, as a generic psychologist_____ or specifically as a school psychologist_____
   If no, do you desire to be licensed? Yes_____ No_____

3. Do you believe that nondoctoral school psychologists should eligible to be licensed? Yes_____ No_____

4. Do you presently have a licensure law for school psychologists in your state which allows for licensing of nondoctoral school psychologists?
   Yes_____ No_____ Don't know_____
   If yes, please respond to the following:
   a. Are you presently licensed at the nondoctoral level? Yes_____ No_____
      If NO, do you intend to seek nondoctoral licensing in the future?
      Yes_____ No_____

5. In your opinion, how important an issue is nondoctoral licensing for the profession of school psychology?

   extremely important 1 2 3 4 5 not at all important

6. How important an issue is nondoctoral licensing for you personally?

   extremely important 1 2 3 4 5 not at all important

7. Rank order the following reasons some people, possibly yourself, would consider nondoctoral licensing important to the profession, where 1=most important and 6=least important. That is, use each number from 1 to 6 only once.
   _____ a. Protects the public from those individuals who are grossly incompetent to practice.
   _____ b. Provides assurances to the public that services are being provided by qualified professionals.
   _____ c. Communicates to the public that they are entitled to administrative redress in the event of negligent, incompetent, or unethical practices on the part of the professional.
   _____ d. Helps the field define the roles and norms of its practitioners as well as establish a professional identity.
   _____ e. Provides the field with a symbol of respectability and accountability signaling it as an established profession.
   _____ f. Enables the profession to gain a monopoly over practice.

9. Rank order the following reasons some people, possibly yourself, would consider nondoctoral licensing issues important personally, where 1=most important and 5=least important. Again, use each number from 1 to 5 only once.
   _____ a. Provides a possibility of increased income.
   _____ b. Provides for greater professional autonomy and independence.
   _____ c. Provides options for employment in different settings.
   _____ d. Makes third-party payments more likely.

_____ e. Increases viability of private practice.

10. Rank order the following reasons some people, possibly yourself, would not consider nondoctoral licensing issues important personally, where 1=most important reason and 4=least important reason. Again, use each number from 1 to 4 only once.
    _____ a. Don't have the time to work outside the school system.
    _____ b. Not interested in working outside the school system.
    _____ c. Don't feel they have the skills to work outside the school system.
    _____ d. Don't feel they have the confidence to work outside the school system.

11. Do you think that the state or national school psychology organization should support and work for licensure at the nondoctoral level?
    If yes, which organizations? No_____
    NASP_____ APA_____ State School Psychology Organization_____ All_____

12. Please read the following items carefully, and then circle the number on the 1 to 5 scale that best represents your feelings or opinions. Please note, these items are hypothetical. They do not represent current policy, nor options for the future. They do provide a basis for estimating sentiment among practicing school psychologists regarding what has been a very controversial issue.

	Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree
a. Although I may not practice independently, it is important that I have the right to do so.	1	2	3	4	5
b. The doctoral level is the appropriate entry level for private practice.	1	2	3	4	5
c. Resolution of the independent practice issue between NASP and APA is important.	1	2	3	4	5
d. NASP spends too much time working toward independent practice for nondoctoral school psychologists.	1	2	3	4	5
e. The right to engage in private practice is not relevant to most nondoctoral school psychologists.	1	2	3	4	5
f. I would support a NASP decision to endorse the doctoral entry level for independent practice.	1	2	3	4	5
g. I could support a joint NASP/APA resolution supporting nondoctoral entry and private practice through 1995, at which time the doctoral level would become the entry level.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Agree 1	2	Neutral 3	4	Strongly Disagree 5
h. Nondoctoral practitioners do not have sufficient training to practice independently.					
i. NASP should continue current positions regarding nondoctoral independent practice in both the public and private sectors.					

j. Comments.

THANK YOU!

NATIONAL SURVEY OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

November, 1985 Practitioner Sample

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

1) Sex (check): Male_____ Female_____

2) Age (check): under 25_____ 25-34_____ 35-44 _____
45-54 _____ 55-64_____ over 64_____

3) Years of experience as a school psychologist?_________

4) Do you have a certificate as a teacher? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, in what area(s)?
elementary_____ secondary_____ special education_____

5) Have you taught on a full-time basis? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, please specify level and years of experience.

6) What is your level of graduate education in school psychology?
_____Masters Degree (about 30 semester hours)
_____Masters Degree (about 45 semester hours)
_____Specialist Degree (about 60 semester hours)
_____Doctoral Degree

7) At what institutions have you done graduate work in school psychology?

Institution Name Location Major Degree Year

a) ____________________ __________________ _________________________
Degree__________ Year___________

b) ____________________ __________________ _________________________
Degree__________ Year__________

8) What is the primary setting of your employment? (check)
a) public schools_____ b) college or university_____
b) private practice_____ d) institutional/residential_____
e) other (specify)___________________

9) What is the nature of the community of your primary employment setting? (check)
a) largely urban_____ b) largely rural_____
c) largely suburban_____ d) combination of ________________________
(specify)

10) What is the ratio of school psychologists to students in your setting
(for example, one psychologist per 2,000 students)?________________

11) What per cent of the students in your setting are minority?_____
What per cent of these students are, black_____; Hispanic_____;
Oriental_____; Native Indian_____.

12) Do you spend more than 25% of your time on a special assignment with a specific type of handicapped student (e.g., hearing impaired, severely retarded, etc.)? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, please describe.

13) What is your annual salary paid by your primary employer? (check)
a) below $10,000 _____
b) $10,000-$12,999_____
c) $13,000-$15,999_____
d) $16,000-$18,999_____
e) $19,000-$21,999_____
f) $22,000-$24,999_____
g) $25,000-$29,999_____
h) $30,000-$34,999_____
i) $35,000-$39,999_____
j) $40,000-$44,999_____
k) $45,000-$49,999_____
l) $50,000 & over _____

14) Are you engaged in outside/secondary employment? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, please check the type of employment below:
a) private practice_____
b) teach at college/university_____
c) consult with schools_____
d) consult with agencies_____
e) other (specify)____
If no, do you plan to engage in outside employment in the future? If so, please specify.

15) What is the approximate amount of annual income from outside/secondary employment?
_____below $ 1,000
_____$1,000-$5,000
_____$5,000-$10,000
_____over $10,000
_____I prefer to NOT disclose this information.

16) Is your income as a school psychologist (check one):
_____ a. the principal source of income in your household
_____ b. about equal to another source of income in your household (e.g., spouse's income)
_____ c. secondary to another source of income in your household

III. JOB ROLES, SATISFACTION, AND EFFICACY:

1. How satisfied are you in your position as a school psychologist?

   extremely satisfied 1 2 3 4 5 not at all satisfied

2. How well does your role as a school psychologist conform to your initial expectations for the position?

   extremely well 1 2 3 4 5 not at all well

3. Do you plan to continue to work as a school psychologist in the future?
   a. no_____
   b. 1-3 years_____
   c. 4-6 years_____
   d. 7-8 years_____
   e. over 10 years_____
   f. until retirement_____

4. Would you choose school psychology as a career if you could make the choice again? Yes_____ No_____
   If NO, please indicate the more important reasons for your response.

5. Please rank order the following aspects of your professional position on the basis of the satisfaction that they provide, where 1=most satisfying and 7=least satisfying. That is, use each number on the scale only once so that the items are ranked in terms of satisfaction from 1 to 7.

   _____ a. positively influencing children and youth through assessment and interventions.
   _____ b. positively influencing children and youth through influence on placement and programming decisions.
   _____ c. salary and benefits.
   _____ d. colleagues and professionals with whom you work.
   _____ e. working within the educational system.
   _____ f. work hours and extended time off in the summer.
   _____ g. status in the community.

   _____ h. other (Please specify)

6. Please estimate the amount of time you spend with special education services, e.g., conducting preplacement evaluations, staffings, follow-up on placements, and re-evaluations.
   Less than 10%_____
   10% - 25% _____
   26% - 50% _____
   51% - 75%_____
   76% - 90%_____
   Over 90% _____

NASP Survey - Practitioner Sample

IV. EVALUATION OF TRAINING AND CONTINUING EDUCATION NEEDS:

This information will help determine the content of NASP continuing education programs.

For each area, rate the quality of your graduate education program and the extent of your present continuing education needs using the following scales:

Quality of Training	Need and Desire for Continuing Education
5 = poor	5 = low
4 = fair	4 = moderately low
3 = average	3 = moderate
2 = good	2 = high
1 = excellent	1 = very high

	Quality of Training	Need and Desire for Continuing Education
A. Individual Psychoeducational Assessment		
1. educational skills, reading, math, etc.	____	____
2. intelligence	____	____
3. neuropsychological functioning	____	____
4. adaptive behavior	____	____
5. projective personality techniques	____	____
6. systematic observation procedures	____	____
7. nonbiased or nondiscriminatory techniques and procedures	____	____
B. Consultation Methods and Intervention Techniques		
1. behavioral consultation	____	____
2. mental health consultation	____	____
3. organizational/systems consultation	____	____
4. remedial education programs	____	____
5. behavior management in the classroom	____	____
6. home-based interventions	____	____
7. community referral sources	____	____
8. counseling methods and skills	____	____
9. methods for evaluating outcomes of interventions	____	____

NASP Survey - Practitioner Sample

Quality of Training	Need and Desire for Continuing Education
5 = poor	5 = low
4 = fair	4 = moderately low
3 = average	3 = moderate
2 = good	2 = high
1 = excellent	1 = very high

	Quality of Training	Need and Desire for Continuing Education
10. Interventions in regular education for students with learning problems	____	____
11. Interventions in regular education for students with behavioral/emotional problems	____	____
C. Assessment and Interventions with Special Populations		
1. learning disabled	____	____
2. mild (educable) mentally retarded	____	____
3. emotionally disturbed	____	____
4. gifted	____	____
5. low incidence (severely retarded, visual, auditory, or physical handicaps, and preschool handicapped)	____	____
6. bilingual students	____	____
7. minority students	____	____

E. Please list three areas in which you need/desire continuing education. (Here you may list one or more of the topics included above OR list new topics.)

1.

2.

3.

V. ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES SURVEY:

Please estimate the number of times per month that you use each of the following assessment instruments or procedures. If you do not use the instrument or procedure at all, or if your use is less than once per month, enter zero (0) on the line. Note, we only need your estimates, not exact counts.

A. Adaptive Behavior

_____Vineland Revised
_____Scales of Independent Behavior
_____Comprehensive Test of Adaptive Behavior
_____AAMD Public School
_____Children's Adaptive Behavior Scale
_____SOMPA-ABIC
_____AAMD-Clinical
_____Other. Please specify below.

B. Ability/Intelligence

_____K-ABC
_____Wechsler Scales
_____Stanford-Binet
_____Bayley
_____Other. Please specify.
_____McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities
_____PPVT-R
_____Woodcock-Johnson Ability

C. Achievement - Screening

_____WRAT or WRAT-R
_____PIAT
_____Woodcock-Johnson Achievement
_____Woodcock Reading
_____Other. Please specify below.

D. Achievement - Diagnostic

_____Durrell
_____Gates-MacGinitie
_____Gray Oral Reading
_____Brigance
_____Key Math
_____Informal Reading Inventory
_____Other. Please specify below.

E. Projectives/Figure Drawings

_____Rorschach
_____Draw A Person
_____House Tree Person
_____Kinetic Family Drawings
_____TAT
_____Other. Please specify.

F. Perceptial/Motor

_____Bender
_____Benton VRT
_____Frostig
_____VAKT
_____Other. Please specify below.

NASP Survey - Practitioner Sample

G. Informal Measures
_____Structured interview such as the Problem Identification Interview
_____Unstructured interview
_____Structured classroom observation (behavioral observation)
_____Unstructured (anecdotal) classroom observation
_____Other. Please specify.

H. Check Lists/Rating Scales
_____MMPI
_____Social Behavior Assessment
_____Walker Problem Behavior Checklist
_____Achenbach-Edelbrock
_____Other checklist completed by teacher (Please list below)
_____Other checklist completed by parent (Please list below)

I. Batteries & Miscellaneous
_____SOMPA Sociocultural Scales
_____SOMPA Health History Inventory
_____SOMPA Physical Dexterity Battery
_____SOMPA Estimated Learning Potential
_____M-MAC
_____Developmental Checklist (Specify below)
_____LPAD (or variation thereof)
_____Boehm Test of Basic Concepts
_____Bracken Basic Concepts Scale

J. Assessment Instruments/Procedures Need(s)
What kind of new or additional assessment procedure(s) or instrument(s) would help you most in your work? Please describe.

NASP Survey - Practitioner Sample

VI. LD ISSUES:

Please respond to the following items using a scale where 1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree.

1 2 3 4 5
/_______/_______/_______/_______/
Strongly Agree — Neutral — Strongly Disagree

1) Too many students are being classified as learning disabled and placed in special education.
1 2 3 4 5
/_____/_____/_____/_____/

2) The increase in learning disabled incidence is due in large part to reluctance to use the classifications of mild mental retardation or emotional disturbance/behavior disorder.
1 2 3 4 5
/_____/_____/_____/_____/

3) The requirement of a processing deficit should be added to or strengthened in the LD classification requirements.
1 2 3 4 5
/_____/_____/_____/_____/

4) LD classification should be based on the exclusion factors and a severe discrepancy between achievement and ability.
1 2 3 4 5
/_____/_____/_____/_____/

5) Better regular classroom instruction would prevent many students from being classified as LD.
1 2 3 4 5
/_____/_____/_____/_____/

6) School psychologists should assist teachers in designing, implementing, and evaluating prereferral interventions before students are considered for LD classification.
1 2 3 4 5
/_____/_____/_____/_____/

7) The delivery system needs to be changed so that remedial services can be provided without classifying students as learning disabled.
1 2 3 4 5
/_____/_____/_____/_____/

8) Special education services for students classified as learning disabled are usually quite effective.
1 2 3 4 5
/_____/_____/_____/_____/

9) The educational needs of students classified as learning disabled and mildly (educable) mentally retarded are very similar.
1 2 3 4 5
/_____/_____/_____/_____/

10) The educational needs of students classified as learning disabled and emotionally disturbed/behavior disordered are very similar.

1 2 3 4 5
/______/______/______/______/______/

11) Remedial and compensatory education from regular education, and special education progams for the mildly handicapped, should be merged (e.g., combine Chapter I and LD resource).

1 2 3 4 5
/______/______/______/______/______/

12) Overrepresentation of minority students in special education programs for the mildly handicapped is discriminatory.

1 2 3 4 5
/______/______/______/______/______/

13) School psychologists are more effective if they concentrate on accurate and thorough diagnosis rather than assisting with or carrying out interventions.

1 2 3 4 5
/______/______/______/______/______/

14) It is important to maintain clear distinctions between special and regular education, and between slow learner-low achievers and learning disabled students.

1 2 3 4 5
/______/______/______/______/______/

15) Students are often classified as learning disabled so that services can be provided even though they are not really handicapped.

1 2 3 4 5
/______/______/______/______/______/

16) Comments on LD incidence or related issues.

THANK YOU!

NATIONAL SURVEY OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

November, 1985

NASP Leadership

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION.

1) Sex (check): Male_____ Female_____

2) Age (check): under 25_____ 25-34_____ 35-44 _____
45-54 _____ 55-64_____ over 64_____

3) Years of experience as a school psychologist?_________

4) Do you have a certificate as a teacher? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, in what area(s)?
elementary_____ secondary_____ special education_____

5) Have you taught on a full-time basis? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, please specify level and years of experience.

6) What is your level of graduate education in school psychology?
_____Masters Degree (about 30 semester hours)
_____Masters Degree (about 45 semester hours)
_____Specialist Degree (about 60 semester hours)
_____Doctoral Degree

7) At what institutions have you done graduate work in school psychology?

Institution Name	Location	Major
a) ____________________	__________________	________________________
Degree_________	Year_________	
b) ____________________	__________________	________________________
Degree_________	Year_________	

8) What is the primary setting of your employment? (check)
a) public schools_____ b) college or university_____
b) private practice_____ d) institutional/residential_____
e) other (specify)___________________

9) What is your annual salary paid by your primary employer? (check)
a) below $10,000 _____
b) $10,000-$12,999_____
c) $13,000-$15,999_____
d) $16,000-$18,999_____
e) $19,000-$21,999_____
f) $22,000-$24,999_____
g) $25,000-$29,999_____
h) $30,000-$34,999_____
i) $35,000-$39,999_____
j) $40,000-$44,999_____
k) $45,000-$49,999_____
l) $50,000 & over _____

10) Are you engaged in outside/secondary employment? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, please check the type of employment below:
a) private practice_____ b) teach at college/university_____
c) consult with schools_____ d) consult with agencies_____
e) other (specify)____
If no, do you plan to engage in outside employment in the future? If so, please specify.

NATIONAL SURVEY OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

November, 1985 NASP Leadership

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION.

1) Sex (check): Male_____ Female_____

2) Age (check): under 25_____ 25-34_____ 35-44 _____
45-54 _____ 55-64_____ over 64_____

3) Years of experience as a school psychologist?__________

4) Do you have a certificate as a teacher? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, in what area(s)?
elementary_____ secondary_____ special education_____

5) Have you taught on a full-time basis? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, please specify level and years of experience.

6) What is your level of graduate education in school psychology?
_____Masters Degree (about 30 semester hours)
_____Masters Degree (about 45 semester hours)
_____Specialist Degree (about 60 semester hours)
_____Doctoral Degree

7) At what institutions have you done graduate work in school psychology?

Institution Name Location Major

a) ____________________ __________________ _________________________
Degree__________ Year__________

b) ____________________ __________________ _________________________
Degree__________ Year__________

8) What is the primary setting of your employment? (check)
a) public schools_____ b) college or university_____
b) private practice_____ d) institutional/residential_____
e) other (specify)___________________

9) What is your annual salary paid by your primary employer? (check)
a) below $10,000 _____
b) $10,000-$12,999_____
c) $13,000-$15,999_____
d) $16,000-$18,999_____
e) $19,000-$21,999_____
f) $22,000-$24,999_____
g) $25,000-$29,999_____
h) $30,000-$34,999_____
i) $35,000-$39,999_____
j) $40,000-$44,999_____
k) $45,000-$49,999_____
l) $50,000 & over _____

10) Are you engaged in outside/secondary employment? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, please check the type of employment below:
a) private practice_____ b) teach at college/university_____
c) consult with schools_____ d) consult with agencies_____
e) other (specify)____
If no, do you plan to engage in outside employment in the future? If so, please specify.

11) What is the approximate amount of annual income from outside/secondary employment?
_____below $ 1,000 _____$1,000-$5,000 _____$5,000-$10,000
_____over $10,000 _____I prefer to NOT disclose this information.

12) Is your income as a school psychologist (check one):
_____ a. the principal source of income in your household
_____ b. about equal to another source of income in your household (e.g., spouse's income)
_____ c. secondary to another source of income in your household

II. NASP LEADERSHIP ROLE(S).

1) Please indicate your leadership roles in NASP - Check all that apply.
_____Officer _____Committee Chair
_____Director _____Delegate

2) How many years have you been involved with the NASP Leadership?
_____0-1 _____8-10
_____2-4 _____Over 10
_____5-7

3) Are you currently in a NASP Leadership Role, i.e., serving as an Officer, Director, Delegate, or Committee Chair in 1985-86?
Yes_____ No_____

4) Did you serve as an officer between 1976-1985? Yes_____ No_____

III. NASP SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES: PRIORITIES AND IMPORTANCE.

In your opinion, how important are the following NASP services and activities? Please circle the number which corresponds to your rating where:

1	2	3	4	5	No Opinion
Crucial Top Priority First		Moderate Importance		Low Priority Less Important	☐

	Top		Moderate		Low	No Opinion
1) Development and implementation of standards for graduate programs.	1	2	3	4	5	☐
2) Public information and public relations activities.	1	2	3	4	5	☐
3) Liaison with other professional and advocacy groups.	1	2	3	4	5	☐
4) Assistance to State Associations of School Psychologists.	1	2	3	4	5	☐
5) Publications (Review and Communique).	1	2	3	4	5	☐
6) Publications and monographs (e.g., Best Practices in School Psychology)	1	2	3	4	5	☐
7) Professional development training packages in various formats (written, videotape, computer disk, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5	☐
8) Influencing state legislation, rules, regulations, and policy.	1	2	3	4	5	☐
9) Development and promotion of quality standards for school psychological services in schools (ratios, support, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5	☐
10) Development and promotion of rights and opportunities in regard to licensure for private practice.	1	2	3	4	5	☐
11) Influencing Federal legislation, rules, regulations, and policy.	1	2	3	4	5	☐
12) Convention program and workshops.	1	2	3	4	5	☐
13) Providing opportunities to purchase professional liability insurance covering public and private practice.	1	2	3	4	5	☐

NASP Survey - Leadership Sample

	Top Priority				Low Priority	
14) Providing opportunities for more involvement with international school psychology, e.g., sponsoring study tours.	1	2	3	4	5	/__/
15) Promoting change in current delivery system such as non-categorical funding, increased development and use of regular education remedial options for the mildly handicapped, etc.	1	2	3	4	5	/__/

16) In your opinion, what should be the top three NASP priorities?

a)

b)

c)

17) Comments on NASP priorities.

IV. NASP EXECUTIVE/OFFICE STRUCTURE.

Alternatives to the current part-time executive manager - decentralized office structure will be considered by the NASP Delegate Assembly in the near future. The views of the NASP Leadership, past and current, on these matters are very important. Please respond to the following items using the rating scale provided, or, when appropriate, indicate no opinion or lack of knowledge.

Our current costs for the decentralized offices and the part-time management are about $125,000. A consultant has estimated that the additional costs associated with the full-time staff and a central office will be from $5,000 to $50,000, depending on location and other factors.

1) How effective is the current office - manager structure?

1	2	3	4	5	No Opinion
Very Effective		Average		Ineffective	☐

2) A central office would improve services to members and enhance accomplishment of NASP priorities.

1	2	3	4	5	No Opinion
Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree	☐

3) Full-time staff would improve services to members and enhance accomplishment of NASP priorities.

1	2	3	4	5	No Opinion
Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree	☐

4) Full-time staff would significantly improve follow-up on, and implementation of, action by the Executive Board and Delegate Assembly.

1	2	3	4	5	No Opinion
Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree	☐

5) Full-time staff would significantly improve continuity of NASP programs and activities from year to year.

1	2	3	4	5	No Opinion
Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree	☐

NASP Survey - Leadership Sample

6) A central office would improve NASP visibility.

1	2	3	4	5	No Opinion
Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree	☐

7) If a NASP central office is established, it should be in the Washington, DC area.

1	2	3	4	5	No Opinion
Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree	☐

8) The advantages of a central office/full-time staff are sufficient to justify possible additional costs.

1	2	3	4	5	No Opinion
Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree	☐

9) In your view, what would be the major advantages of a Central Office and Full-Time Staff?

10) In your view, what would be the major disadvantages of a Central Office and Full-Time Staff?

11) Other comments on Central Office and/or Full-Time Staff?

V. SPRING DELEGATE ASSEMBLY - EXECUTIVE BOARD (DA-EB) REIMBURSEMENT.

As you may know, NASP Delegates, Directors, and Officers are reimbursed for expenses incurred for participating in the Fall Delegate Assembly - Executive Board (DA-EB) meeting. Members of the EB (Regional Directors and Officers) are reimbursed for expenses incurred for the July and January EB meetings. Expenses incurred for participating in the Spring DA-EB are not reimbursed. That meeting is scheduled during, just before, or immediately after the NASP Annual Convention.

A proposal to begin reimbursement of Delegates, Directors, and Officers for attending the Spring DA-EB will be considered by the DA-EB in April, 1986 in meetings held immediately after the 1986 Convention. Although there are many pro and con considerations, the major arguments are: (1) Requiring delegates, directors, and officers to assume full responsibility for the spring EB-DA expenses creates a hardship for some persons and may discourage participation by some members; vs (2) Reimbursement would consume funds which are needed to support other objectives of the association, and attending the national convention is a responsibility of NASP members.

Your opinions on this issue are very important to the DA-EB deliberations.

1) Have you participated in NASP leadership? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, indicate: _____Delegate _____Director _____Officer
_____Committee Chair

2) Would (or has) the absence of reimbursement for the Spring DA-EB held at the convention influence your decision to be active in the NASP leadership? _____Yes _____Makes little difference _____No

3) Would (or does) your employer or your state association reimburse your expenses for attending the DA-EB at the NASP convention?
_____Yes (full or partial) _____No _____Uncertain or I don't know
If Yes or Uncertain on Item 3, then answer Items 4 & 5. If No to Item 3, go to Item 6.

4) How much reimbursement is (or would be) provided? _____Full _____Partial
If Partial, what amount or percent of costs would be paid?__________

5) Would your employer or your state association continue to reimburse your expenses IF reimbursement from NASP were available?
_____Yes _____No _____Don't know

6) Do you think NASP should reimburse the expenses of Delegates, Directors, and Officers at the Spring DA-EB?
_____Yes _____No _____No Opinion
If you answered Yes to Item 6, please indicate the level of reimbursement that seems most appropriate to you.

Level of Reimbursement	Estimated Cost
_____Meals only for the 2-3 days that the DA-EB meets	$ 3-$ 5,000
_____Lodging only (for the 2-3 days that the DA-EB meets)	$ 3-$ 5,000
_____Meals and lodging	$ 6-$10,000
_____Travel only	$25-$40,000
_____Full reimbursement	$30-$50,000

VI. SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY CREDENTIALING (Note. In this section, license refers to legal authority to engage in private practice, and certification refers to legal authority to practice in the public schools):

1. Are you certified to provide services in schools as a school psychologist?
   Yes_____ No_____

2. Are you licensed for private practice? Yes_____ No_____
   If yes, as a generic psychologist_____ or specifically as a school psychologist_____. If no, do you desire to be licensed? Yes_____ No_____

3. Do you believe that nondoctoral school psychologists should eligible to be licensed? Yes_____ No_____

4. Do you presently have a licensure law for school psychologists in your state which allows for licensing of nondoctoral school psychologists?
   Yes_____ No_____ Don't know_____
   If yes, please respond to the following:
   a. Are you presently licensed at the nondoctoral level? Yes_____ No_____
      If NO, do you intend to seek nondoctoral licensing in the future?
      Yes_____ No_____

5. In your opinion, how important an issue is nondoctoral licensing for the profession of school psychology?

   extremely important 1 2 3 4 5 not at all important

6. How important an issue is nondoctoral licensing for you personally?

   extremely important 1 2 3 4 5 not at all important

7. Rank order the following reasons some people, possibly yourself, would consider nondoctoral licensing important to the profession, where 1=most important and 6=least important. That is, use each number from 1 to 6 only once.
   _____ a. Protects the public from those individuals who are grossly incompetent to practice.
   _____ b. Provides assurances to the public that services are being provided by qualified professionals.
   _____ c. Communicates to the public that they are entitled to administrative redress in the event of negligent, incompetent, or unethical practices on the part of the professional.
   _____ d. Helps the field define the roles and norms of its practitioners as well as establish a professional identity.
   _____ e. Provides the field with a symbol of respectability and accountability signaling it as an established profession.
   _____ f. Enables the profession to gain a monopoly over practice.

8. Rank order the following reasons some people, possibly yourself, would consider nondoctoral licensing issues important personally, where 1=most important and 5=least important. Again, use each number from 1 to 5 only once.
   _____ a. Provides a possibility of increased income.
   _____ b. Provides for greater professional autonomy and independence.
   _____ c. Provides options for employment in different settings.
   _____ d. Makes third-party payments more likely.
   _____ e. Increases viability of private practice.

NASP Survey - Leadership Sample

9. Rank order the following reasons some people, possibly yourself, would not consider nondoctoral licensing issues important personally, where 1=most important reason and 4=least important reason. Again, use each number from 1 to 4 only once.
_____ a. Don't have the time to work outside the school system.
_____ b. Not interested in working outside the school system.
_____ c. Don't feel they have the skills to work outside the school system.
_____ d. Don't feel they have the confidence to work outside the school system.

10. Do you think that the state or national school psychology organization should support and work for licensure at the nondoctoral level?
If yes, which organizations? No_____
NASP_____ APA_____ State School Psychology Organization_____ All_____

11. Please read the following items carefully, and then circle the number on the 1 to 5 scale that best represents your feelings or opinions. Please note, these items are hypothetical. They do not represent current policy, nor options for the future. They do provide a basis for estimating sentiment among practicing school psychologists regarding what has been a very controversial issue.

	Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree
a. Although I may not practice independently, it is important that I have the right to do so.	1	2	3	4	5
b. The doctoral level is the appropriate entry level for private practice.	1	2	3	4	5
c. Resolution of the independent practice issue between NASP and APA is important.	1	2	3	4	5
d. NASP spends too much time working toward independent practice for nondoctoral school psychologists.	1	2	3	4	5
e. The right to engage in private practice is not relevant to most nondoctoral school psychologists.	1	2	3	4	5
f. I would support a NASP decision to endorse the doctoral entry level for independent practice.	1	2	3	4	5
g. I could support a joint NASP/APA resolution supporting nondoctoral entry and private practice through 1995, at which time the doctoral level would become the entry level.	1	2	3	4	5
h. Nondoctoral practitioners do not have sufficient training to practice independently.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree
i. NASP should continue current positions regarding nondoctoral independent practice in both the public and private sectors.	1	2	3	4	5

j. Comments.

VI. LD ISSUES.

Please respond to the following items using a scale where 1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree

1) Too many students are being classified as learning disabled and placed in special education.	1	2	3	4	5
2) The increase in learning disabled incidence is due in large part to reluctance to use the classifications of mild mental retardation or emotional disturbance/behavior disorder.	1	2	3	4	5
3) The requirement of a processing deficit should be added to or strengthened in the LD classification requirements.	1	2	3	4	5
4) LD classification should be based on the exclusion factors and a severe discrepancy between achievement and ability.	1	2	3	4	5
5) Better regular classroom instruction would prevent many students from being classified as LD.	1	2	3	4	5
6) School psychologists should assist teachers in designing, implementing, and evaluating prereferral interventions before students are considered for LD classification.	1	2	3	4	5

7) The delivery system needs to be changed so that remedial services can be provided without classifying students as learning disabled.	1 2 3 4 5 /___/___/___/___/
8) Special education services for students classified as learning disabled are usually quite effective.	1 2 3 4 5 /___/___/___/___/
9) The educational needs of students classified as learning disabled and mildly (educable) mentally retarded are very similar.	1 2 3 4 5 /___/___/___/___/
10) The educational needs of students classified as learning disabled and emotionally disturbed/behavior disordered are very similar.	1 2 3 4 5 /___/___/___/___/
11) Remedial and compensatory education from regular education, and special education progams for the mildly handicapped, should be merged (e.g., combine Chapter I and LD resource).	1 2 3 4 5 /___/___/___/___/
12) Overrepresentation of minority students in special education programs for the mildly handicapped is discriminatory.	1 2 3 4 5 /___/___/___/___/
13) School psychologists are more effective if they concentrate on accurate and thorough diagnosis rather than assisting with or carrying out interventions.	1 2 3 4 5 /___/___/___/___/
14) It is important to maintain clear distinctions between special and regular education, and between slow learner-low achievers and learning disabled students.	1 2 3 4 5 /___/___/___/___/
15) Students are often classified as learning disabled so that services can be provided even though they are not really handicapped.	1 2 3 4 5 /___/___/___/___/

16) Comments on LD incidence or related issues.

THANK YOU!

Appendix D

March, 1986

NATIONAL SURVEY OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY FACULTY

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION.

1) Sex (check): Male_____ Female_____

2) Age (check): under 25_____ 25-34_____ 35-44 _____
45-54 _____ 55-64_____ over 64_____

3) Do you regard school psychology as your primary area of interest?
Yes_____ No_____
If no, what is your primary area of interest?______________________________

4) Years of experience as a school psychologist in a practitioner role?_____

5) Years of experience on a university faculty?__________

6) Over the past 12 months, have you authored or co-authored
Yes___ No___ an article in a refereed journal
Yes___ No___ a book chapter
Yes___ No___ a book
Yes___ No___ Newsletter item

7) Do you have a certificate as a public school teacher? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, in what area(s)?
elementary_____ secondary_____ special education _____

8) Have you taught in the public schools on a full-time basis? Yes___ No___
If yes, please specify level and years of experience.

9) What is your annual full-time salary paid by your primary employer (include summer teaching)? (check)
a) below $16,000 _____
b) $16,000-$18,999_____
c) $19,000-$21,999_____
d) $22,000-$24,999_____
e) $25,000-$29,999_____
f) $30,000-$34,999_____
g) $35,000-$39,999_____
h) $40,000-$44,999_____
i) $45,000-$49,999_____
j) $50,000-$54,999_____
k) $55,000-$59,999_____
l) $60,000-$64,999_____
m) over $65,000 _____

10) Is your income (check one):
_____ a. the principal source of income in your household
_____ b. about equal to another source of income in your household (e.g., spouse's income)
_____ c. secondary to another source of income in your household

11) Are you engaged in outside/secondary employment? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, please check the type of employment below:
a) private practice_____ b) consult with schools_____
c) consult with agencies_____ d) part-time work in public schools_____
e) other (specify)____
If no, do you plan to engage in outside employment in the future? If so, please specify.

12) What is the approximate amount of annual income from outside/secondary employment?

_____below $ 1,000 _____$1,000-$4,999 _____$5,000-$9,999
_____$10,000-$14,999 _____$15,000-$19,999 _____$20,000-$24,999
_____over $25,000 _____I prefer to NOT disclose this information.

13) What is your rank? Instructor_____ Assistant Professor_____
Associate Professor_____ Professor_____

14) Are you tenured? Yes_____ No_____

15) What is the relative importance of teaching, research, and service in promotion/tenure and salary determination at your institution?

	1	2	3	4	5
Teaching	Most Important	Very Important	Some Importance	Little Importance	Not Important
Research & Publication	Most Important	Very Important	Some Importance	Little Importance	Not Important
Service	Most Important	Very Important	Some Importance	Little Importance	Not Important

16) Over the next five years, how many new school psychology faculty vacancies do you anticipate, i.e., vacancies from either creation of a new position or as a replacement for someone who has retired?
0_____ 1_____ 2_____ 3_____ 4_____ 5 or more_____

17) How many graduate student committees did you serve on over the last 12 months? __________

18) How many school psychology students are you advising now, i.e., serving as "major professor" or "program advisor?" __________

19) Do you advise undergraduates? Yes___ No___
If yes, how many? __________

20) How many theses or dissertations did you direct in the last 12 months?
____

21) What accreditation does your program have? (check all that apply)
_____APA _____NASP-NCATE _____State Approval

22) What degrees are offered through your program? (check all that apply)
_____M.S. _____Specialist _____Ph.D. _____Psy.D. _____D.Ed. or Ed.D.

23) Total number of students enrolled in school psychology
_____M.S. _____Specialist _____Doctoral _____Certificate _____Only

24) What is the student enrollment trend in the school psychology graduate program at your institution?
_____Large increase ______Slight increase _____Stable, no change
_____Slight Decrease _____Large Decrease

25) About how many new students do you admit each year?
non-doctoral_____ doctoral_____

26) About how many students will graduate from your program in 1986?
non-doctoral_____ doctoral_____

27) How many credit/hours do you teach per academic year, excluding summer? Please indicate whether the credits are quarter or semester hours.

28) What courses do you teach? (Please indicate whether quarter of semester hours, and whether the course is primarily for graduate or undergraduate credit.)

Course	Times Taught per Year	Credit Hours	Semester or Quarter	Grad or Undergrad
1)				
2)				
3)				
4)				
5)				
6)				
7)				
8)				
9)				
10)				

II. GRADUATE PROGRAM STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES.

For each of the areas listed, please indicate your judgments of the Quality and Need to Improve where

	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of Training in your Program	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor
Desire to Improve in your program	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low

A. Individual Psychoeducational Assessment	Quality	Improve
1. educational skills, reading, math, etc.	____	____
2. intelligence	____	____
3. neuropsychological functioning	____	____
4. adaptive behavior	____	____
5. projective personality techniques	____	____
6. systematic observation procedures	____	____
7. nonbiased or nondiscriminatory techniques and procedures	____	____
B. Consultation Methods and Intervention Techniques		
1. behavioral consultation	____	____
2. mental health consultation	____	____
3. organizational/systems consultation	____	____
4. remedial education programs	____	____
5. behavior management in the classroom	____	____
6. home-based interventions	____	____
7. community referral sources	____	____
8. counseling methods and skills	____	____
9. methods for evaluating outcomes of interventions	____	____
10. interventions in regular education for students with learning problems	____	____
11. interventions in regular education for students with behavioral/emotional problems	____	____

Quality of Training in your Program	1	2	3	4	5
	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor
Desire to Improve in your program	1	2	3	4	5
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low

C. Assessment and Interventions with Special Populations

	Quality	Improve
1. learning disabled	____	____
2. mild (educable) mentally retarded	____	____
3. emotionally disturbed	____	____
4. gifted	____	____
5. low incidence (severely retarded, visual, auditory, or physical handicaps, and preschool handicapped)	____	____
6. bilingual students	____	____
7. minority students	____	____

E. Please list three areas which need to be improved in your program. (Here you may list one or more of the topics included above OR list new topics.)

1.

2.

3.

III. ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES.

Please check the most appropriate blank to indicate how the following test/assessment instruments or procedures are taught in your program, where

SUPERVISED PRACTICED - The student will actually administer, write up and interpret at least one test.

DEMONSTRATED & REVIEWED - The test is described and demonstrated.

NOT COVERED - The test may be mentioned in a text or lecture but is not demonstrated or used.

TEST/ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT	SUPERVISED PRACTICE	DEMONSTRATED & REVIEWED	NOT COVERED
A. Adaptive Behavior			
Vineland Revised	____	____	____
Scales of Independent Behavior	____	____	____
Comprehensive Test of Adaptive Behavior	____	____	____
AAMD Public School	____	____	____
Alpern-Ball	____	____	____
Children's Adaptive Behavior Scale	____	____	____
SOMPA-ABIC	____	____	____
AAMD-Clinical	____	____	____
Gesell	____	____	____
Other (specify)	____	____	____
B. Ability/Intelligence			
K-ABC	____	____	____
Wechsler Scales	____	____	____
Stanford-Binet	____	____	____
Bayley	____	____	____
Leiter International Performance Scale	____	____	____
McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities	____	____	____
PPVT-R	____	____	____
Woodcock-Johnson Ability	____	____	____
Other (specify)	____	____	____
C. Achievement = Screening			
WRAT or WRAT-R	____	____	____
PIAT	____	____	____
Woodcock-Johnson Achievement	____	____	____
Metropolitan Achievement Test	____	____	____
Boder Tests of Reading Spelling Patterns	____	____	____
Gilmore Oral Reading	____	____	____
Woodcock Reading	____	____	____
Other (specify)	____	____	____

TEST/ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT	SUPERVISED PRACTICE	DEMONSTRATED & REVIEWED	NOT COVERED
D. Achievement = Diagnostic			
Durrell	____	____	____
Gates-MacGinitie	____	____	____
Gray Oral Reading	____	____	____
Brigance	____	____	____
Key Math	____	____	____
Informal Reading Inventory	____	____	____
TOWL	____	____	____
Other (specify)	____	____	____
E. Projectives/Figure Drawings			
Rorschach	____	____	____
Draw a Person	____	____	____
House Tree Person	____	____	____
Kinetic Family Drawings	____	____	____
TAT	____	____	____
CAT	____	____	____
Roberts Appreciation Test	____	____	____
Guess Why	____	____	____
Sentence Completion	____	____	____
Piers-Harris Self Concept Scale	____	____	____
Other (specify)	____	____	____
F. Perceptual/Motor			
Bender	____	____	____
Benton VRT	____	____	____
Frostig	____	____	____
VAKT	____	____	____
MVPT	____	____	____
VMI	____	____	____
VADS	____	____	____
Other (specify)	____	____	____
G. Informal Measures			
Structured interview such as the Problem Identification Interview	____	____	____
Unstructured interview	____	____	____
Structured classroom observation (behavioral observation)	____	____	____
Unstructured (anecdotal) classroom observation	____	____	____
Other (specify)	____	____	____

TEST/ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT	SUPERVISED PRACTICE	DEMONSTRATED & REVIEWED	NOT COVERED
H. Check Lists/Rating Scales			
MMPI	____	____	____
Social Behavior Assessment	____	____	____
Walker Problem Behavior Checklist	____	____	____
Achenback-Edelbrock	____	____	____
Conners	____	____	____
Burk's Behavior Rating Scale	____	____	____
Devereux	____	____	____
BES Quay-Peterson	____	____	____
Other checklist completed by teacher (specify)	____	____	____
Other checklist completed by parent (specify)	____	____	____
I. Batteries & Miscellaneous			
SOMPA Sociocultural Scales	____	____	____
SOMPA Health History Inventory	____	____	____
SOMPA Physical Dexterity Battery	____	____	____
SOMPA Estimated Learning Potential	____	____	____
M-MAC (McDermont)	____	____	____
LPAD (or variation thereof)	____	____	____
Boehm Test of Basic Concepts	____	____	____
Bracken Basic Concepts Scale	____	____	____
Developmental Checklist (specify)	____	____	____

J. Assessment Instruments/Procedures Need(s)

What kind of new or additional assessment procedure(s) or instrument(s) would be most useful to school psychology practice. Please describe.

IV. LD ISSUES:

Please respond to the following items using a scale where 1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree.

1 2 3 4 5
/_____/_____/_____/_____/
Strongly Neutral Strongly
Agree Disagree

1) Too many students are being classified as learning disabled and placed in special education.
1 2 3 4 5
/_____/_____/_____/_____/

2) The increase in learning disabled incidence is due in large part to reluctance to use the classifications of mild mental retardation or emotional disturbance/behavior disorder.
1 2 3 4 5
/_____/_____/_____/_____/

3) The requirement of a processing deficit should be added to or strengthened in the LD classification requirements.
1 2 3 4 5
/_____/_____/_____/_____/

4) LD classification should be based on the exclusion factors and a severe discrepancy between achievement and ability.
1 2 3 4 5
/_____/_____/_____/_____/

5) Better regular classroom instruction would prevent many students from being classified as LD.
1 2 3 4 5
/_____/_____/_____/_____/

6) School psychologists should assist teachers in designing, implementing, and evaluating prereferral interventions before students are considered for LD classification.
1 2 3 4 5
/_____/_____/_____/_____/

7) The delivery system needs to be changed so that remedial services can be provided without classifying students as learning disabled.
1 2 3 4 5
/_____/_____/_____/_____/

8) Special education services for students classified as learning disabled are usually quite effective.
1 2 3 4 5
/_____/_____/_____/_____/

9) The educational needs of students classified as learning disabled and mildly (educable) mentally retarded are very similar.
1 2 3 4 5
/_____/_____/_____/_____/

10) The educational needs of students classified as learning disabled and emotionally disturbed/behavior disordered are very similar.

1 2 3 4 5
/______/______/______/______/______/

11) Remedial and compensatory education from regular education, and special education progams for the mildly handicapped, should be merged (e.g., combine Chapter I and LD resource).

1 2 3 4 5
/______/______/______/______/______/

12) Overrepresentation of minority students in special education programs for the mildly handicapped is discriminatory.

1 2 3 4 5
/______/______/______/______/______/

13) School psychologists are more effective if they concentrate on accurate and thorough diagnosis rather than assisting with or carrying out interventions.

1 2 3 4 5
/______/______/______/______/______/

14) It is important to maintain clear distinctions between special and regular education, and between slow learner-low achievers and learning disabled students.

1 2 3 4 5
/______/______/______/______/______/

15) Students are often classified as learning disabled so that services can be provided even though they are not really handicapped.

1 2 3 4 5
/______/______/______/______/______/

16) Comments on LD incidence or related issues.

V. SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY CREDENTIALING (Note. In this section, license refers to legal authority to engage in private practice, and certification refers to legal authority to practice in the public schools):

1. Are you certified to provide services in schools as a school psychologist?
   Yes_____ No_____

2. Are you licensed for private practice? Yes_____ No_____
   If yes, as a generic psychologist_____ or specifically as a school psychologist_____
   If no, do you desire to be licensed? Yes_____ No_____

3. Do you believe that nondoctoral school psychologists should eligible to be licensed? Yes_____ No_____

4. Do you presently have a licensure law for school psychologists in your state which allows for licensing of nondoctoral school psychologists?
   Yes_____ No_____ Don't know_____
   If yes, please respond to the following:
   a. Are you presently licensed at the nondoctoral level? Yes_____ No_____
      If NO, do you intend to seek nondoctoral licensing in the future?
      Yes_____ No_____

5. In your opinion, how important an issue is nondoctoral licensing for the profession of school psychology?

   extremely important 1 2 3 4 5 not at all important

6. Please read the following items carefully, and then circle the number on the 1 to 5 scale that best represents your feelings or opinions. Please note, these items are hypothetical. They do not represent current policy, nor options for the future. They do provide a basis for estimating sentiment among practicing school psychologists regarding what has been a very controversial issue.

	Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree
a. Although I may not practice independently, it is important that I have the right to do so.	1	2	3	4	5
b. The doctoral level is the appropriate entry level for private practice.	1	2	3	4	5
c. Resolution of the independent practice issue between NASP and APA is important.	1	2	3	4	5
d. NASP spends too much time working toward independent practice for nondoctoral school psychologists.	1	2	3	4	5
e. The right to engage in private practice is not relevant to most nondoctoral school psychologists.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Agree		Neutral		Strongly Disagree
f. I would support a NASP decision to endorse the doctoral entry level for independent practice.	1	2	3	4	5
g. I could support a joint NASP/APA resolution supporting nondoctoral entry and private practice through 1995, at which time the doctoral level would become the entry level.	1	2	3	4	5
h. Nondoctoral practitioners do not have sufficient training to practice independently.	1	2	3	4	5
i. NASP should continue current positions regarding nondoctoral independent practice in both the public and private sectors.	1	2	3	4	5

j. Comments.

THANK YOU!